DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 022 113 AC 002 595

By-Desmond, Thomas J.

PROCEEDINGS FOR THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY EVENING COLLEGES ON THE EVENING COLLEGE; UNIVERSITY AND COMMUNITY RELATIONS (27TH, DALLAS, TEXAS, OCTOBER 24-28, 1965).

Association of Univ. Evening Colleges, Norman, Okla.

Pub Date 66

Note- 122p.

EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$4.96

Descriptors-ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL, *ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS, COLLEGE FACULTY, *COMMUNITY RELATIONS, CURRICULUM PLANNING, *EVENING COLLEGES, MASS MEDIA, PROGRAM PLANNING, TEACHER EDUCATION, *UNIVERSITY EXTENSION

Proceedings of the 1965 convention of the Association of University Evening Colleges contain a presentation on university and community relations as observed by the evening director at Loyola University of the South, a summary of discussion on the problems and prospects of evening divisions, discussion sessions on special interests (womens education, anti-obsolescence, student publications, and other aspects of university and community relations and communications media), problem clinics on curriculum accreditation, student personnel services, admission and retention, and inservice education for evening college administrators, and the opening and closing business sessions. A 1964-65 financial statement and 15 other supplements and appendixes are included, together with the convention schedule. (ly)

AC002595

Sep 68

ASSOCIATION
EVENING
UNIVERSITY
COLLEGES

a u
e c

ED022113

1965

PROCEEDINGS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

AC002595

ED022113

Dallas

ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY EVENING COLLEGES

PROCEEDINGS

FOR THE

TWENTY-SEVENTH ANNUAL MEETING

THEME:

THE EVENING COLLEGE
UNIVERSITY AND COMMUNITY RELATIONS

OCTOBER 24- 28, 1965
DALLAS, TEXAS

$5.00 per copy
Howell W. McGee, Executive Secretary
Association of University Evening Colleges
University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma

HOST INSTITUTIONS

BAYLOR UNIVERSITY
SOUTHERN METHODIST UNIVERSITY
TEXAS CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY

PREFACE

The twenty-seventh annual convention of A.U.E.C. will long be remembered for the excellent arrangements conceived by the host institutions, and for the "grass-roots" quality of the convention program. The tour of "Six Flags Over Texas," the magnificent view of Dallas from the Chaparral Club, the Chuck Wagon Dinner at the Austin Ranch, and the incomparable banquet setting in the Student Center Ballroom at Southern Methodist University will live long in the memories of convention participants.

Throughout the entire twenty-seventh annual meeting attention was focused on topics central to the interests of the A.U.E.C. membership. The program set the stage for members, new and old, to come to grips with the ongoing problems of the evening college. That this proved to be a popular program format was attested by the many discussion leaders, and others who remarked about the high level of interest, and expressed the wish for more time to continue the discussions.

The task of preparing this publication was lightened by the cooperation and help of many persons. The editor wishes to express his deep appreciation to those recorders who submitted their reports promptly and in the format requested. To Howell W. McGee, executive secretary of our association, a sincere thanks for the excellently prepared minutes of the opening and closing business meetings, and to Thomas B. Nickson, State University of New York at Buffalo, a special thanks for his very capable report of the panel discussion, "Relations With Tomorrow."

The editor is grateful for the advice and guidance of Mrs. Dorothy J. Sickels, Utica College Director of Publications, and for the many helpful contributions of Miss Rosemary E. Ullrich, Assistant Director of Continuing Education. To Miss Mary Morelli, who typed the manuscript and uncovered the editor's errors, my profound thanks. Finally, the editor is indebted to Anthony A. D'Apice, D & D Advertising Agency, Utica, New York, for his personal interest and invaluable help in the final stages of publication.

Thomas J. Desmond, Director
Division of Continuing Education
Utica College of Syracuse University

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

HOST INSTITUTIONS iii

PREFACE v

PART I -- INTRODUCTION

OFFICERS AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, 1964-65 3

PROGRAM OF 1965 ANNUAL MEETING 4

WELCOMING REMARKS - Keith Baker, Vice President
Southern Methodist University 9

PART II -- PRESENTATIONS

KEYNOTE ADDRESS
The Evening College University and Community Relations
Raymond P. Witte, Loyola University 13

RELATIONS WITH TOMORROW 22
Panel:
George H. Daigneault, University of California
H. Lichtenstein, Hofstra University
Richard A. Matre, Loyola University, Chicago
Ernest E. McMahon, Rutgers - The State University
Milton R. Stern, New York University

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN TITLE I OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965 27
Kenneth Haygood, Center For The Study of Liberal Education For Adults

PART III -- DISCUSSION SESSIONS

A. SPECIAL INTEREST SESSIONS

RELATIONS WITH THE UNIVERSITY

Student Relations 31
Evening Faculty Relations 33
University Relations (Faculty and Administration) 34
Community and Junior College Relations 35

PAGE

RELATIONS WITH THE COMMUNITY

Definition of Publics 36
Anti-Obsolescence Programs 37
Programs for Women 38
Cultivation of Publics 39
Business Community Relations 40

COMMUNICATIONS MEDIA

Student Publications 41
University Publications 43
Radio-Television 44
Newspaper 45

B. PROBLEM CLINICS

Business Curriculum Accreditation 47
Education Curriculum Accreditation 48
Student Personnel Services 50
Admission and Retention 51
Administrative Development of Personnel 53

PART IV -- ASSOCIATION BUSINESS

OPENING BUSINESS SESSION 57

CLOSING BUSINESS SESSION 63

SUPPLEMENTS

I - Financial Report 66
II - Committee on Teacher Education through Evening Programs 68
III - Committee on Business Programs through Evening Colleges 77
IV - Legislative Committee 78
V - Joint Committee on Minimum Data and Definitions 83
VI - Advisory Committee 85
VII - Finance Committee 91
VIII - Annual Report of the Regions 92
IX - Research Committee 93
X - Evening Student Personnel 94
XI - Public Relations Committee 95

PART V -- APPENDICES

PAGE

APPENDIX A - Roll of Past Presidents and Annual Meetings 99

APPENDIX B - AUEC Committee Structure, 1964-65 101

APPENDIX C - Officers and Executive Committee, 1965-66 105

APPENDIX D - Roster of Attendance -- Dallas, 1965 106

APPENDIX E - AUEC Committee Structure, 1965-66 115

PART I
INTRODUCTION

OFFICERS AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
1964 - 65

PRESIDENT
Ralph C. Kendall, University of Toledo

VICE PRESIDENT
Robert F. Berner, State University of New York at Buffalo

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY
Howell W. McGee, University of Oklahoma

CHAIRMAN, ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Richard T. Deters, S.J., Xavier University

EDITOR, NEWSLETTER
Gurth I. Abercrombie, Northwestern University

DIRECTORS-AT-LARGE
James F. Baker, Boston University
William C. Huffman, University of Louisville
Curtis H. Moore, Rockford College
Edward C. Pappert, C.S.B., University of Windsor

PROGRAM
TWENTY - SEVENTH ANNUAL CONVENTION

THEME: The Evening College - University and Community Relations

SUNDAY, OCTOBER 24

2:00-7:00 PM Registration
3:00 PM Tour: Six Flags Over Texas

MONDAY, OCTOBER 25

8:30-9:15 AM Registration
9:30-11:30 AM Opening Session

Call to Order:
Ralph C. Kendall, President, AUEC, University of Toledo

Invocation:
N. Lee Dunham (Baylor University)

Welcome:
Keith Baker, Vice President (Southern Methodist University)

Business Meeting:
Ralph C. Kendall, presiding

11:45-12:15 PM AUEC Regional Meetings
12:30- 1:30 PM Luncheon

New Members - Richard A. Matre (Loyola University, Chicago)
Frank R. Neuffer (University of Cincinnati)

Recorders - Thomas J. Desmond (Utica College of Syracuse University)

Members - Robert C. Osborne (Pratt Institute)

2:00-3:00 PM General Session

Chairman: Joseph P. Goddard (University of Tennessee)

Keynote Address - "The Evening College: University and Community Relations"
Raymond P. Witte (Loyola University, New Orleans)

3:15-4:30 PM Special Interest Sessions
RELATIONS WITH THE UNIVERSITY

Group 1. Student Relations
Chairman: Martha L. Farmer (City College of New York)
Resource: Clarence H. Thompson (Drake University)
Walter H. Hayes, Jr. (University of Maryland)
Recorder: Howard W. Benfield (Drexel Institute of Technology)

Group 2. Evening Faculty Relations
Chairman: Stanley J. Gwiazda (Drexel Institute of Technology)
Resource: Marvin E. Hartig (Evansville College)
Dominic LaRusso (University of Washington)
Recorder: Dee Lyons (University of Louisville)

Group 3. University Relations (Faculty and Administration)
Chairman: Gurth I. Abercrombie (Northeastern University)
Resource: Rev. Gerald A. Sugrue (University of San Francisco)
Carl H. Elliott (Purdue University)
Recorder: Franklin A. Power (Boston University)

Group 4. Community and Junior College Relations
Chairman: James R. Quimper (University of Maryland)
Resource: Kermit Johnson (Manatee Junior College)
Byron C. Lambert (Fairleigh Dickinson University)
Recorder: Robert E. Chiles (Hunter College)

4:30-5:30 PM Meeting of Chairmen, AUEC Regions
Chairman: Robert F. Berner, President-elect, AUEC (State University of New York at Buffalo)

Meeting of Other Committees, As Necessary

6:00-7:00 PM Reception, Chaparral Club, Southland Center

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 26

8:30-9:15 AM Committee Meetings, As Necessary
9:30-10:30 AM Special Interest Sessions
RELATIONS WITH THE COMMUNITY

Group 1. - Definition of Publics
Chairman: William C. Huffman (University of Louisville)
Resource: Hamilton Stillwell (Wayne State University)
Lawrence A. Allen (Northeastern University)
Recorder: Viers W. Adams (University of Pittsburgh)

Group 2. Anti-Obsolescence Programs
Chairman: Kenneth Henninger (Illinois Institute of Technology)
Resource: Kingsley M. Wientge (Washington University)
Russell Smith (New York University)
Recorder: Cecil Dobbins (University of Akron)

Group 3. Programs For Women
Chairman: Adelaide H. Jones (Drury College)
Resource: Robert W. Shaw (Queens College, North Carolina)
James F. Baker (Boston University)
Recorder: John P. Donahue (Loyola University, Chicago)

Group 4. Cultivation Of Publics
Chairman: Harry A. McGuff (Indiana Central College)
Resource: Rev. Eric R. O'Connor, S.J. (Thomas More Institute)
L. C. Barden (Drexel Institute of Technology)
Recorder: William D. Barden (University of Tennessee)

Group 5. Business Community Relations
Chairman: Albert E. Everett (Northeastern University)
Resource: Kenneth B. Settle (University of Cincinnati)
William T. Utley (University of Omaha)
Recorder: Roy W. Ilowit (C. W. Post College)

10:45-11:45 AM Special Interest Sessions
COMMUNICATIONS MEDIA

Group 1. Student Publications
Chairman: Thomas J. Dolphin (Clark University)
Resource: Daniel R. Lang (Northwestern University)
O. W. Snarr (Bradley University)
Recorder: H. Rodman Jones (University of Tulsa)

Group 2. University Publications
Chairman: Virgil W. Alexander (Northern Illinois University)
Resource: Paul Betz (St. Joseph's College)
George Knerr (Pace College)
Recorder: Donald J. Herrmann (College of William and Mary)

Group 3. Radio-Television
Chairman: Donald B. Setterbo (University of Toledo)
Resource: M. Robert Allen (University of Miami)
Martin J. O'Hara (Thomas More Institute)
Recorder: Edward D. Shanken (Engineers Joint Council)

Group 4. Newspapers
Chairman: Richard Bray (The American University)
Resource: Howard A. Ward (University of Detroit)
Glen L. Bushey (University of Chattanooga)
Recorder: Leonard S. Stein (St. Louis University)

12:00-1:00 PM General Session
Chairman: Martha L. Farmer (City College of New York)
Presentation: Recent Developments in Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965

Kenneth Haygood (Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults)

FREE AFTERNOON

4:30 PM Chuck Wagon Dinner - Austin Ranch

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 27

8:15-9:15 AM 1965-66 Committees
Organization Meetings

9:30-10:30 AM Closing Business Meeting
Ralph C. Kendall, President (University of Toledo)
Robert F. Berner (State University of New York at Buffalo) President-elect

10:45-12:15 PM **PROBLEM CLINICS**

Group 1. Engineering Curriculum Accreditation
Chairman: Kenneth R. Burchard (Carnegie Institute of Technology)
Resource: Dean B. Armold (Pennsylvania Military College)
Charles P. Bruderle (Villanova University)
Recorder: Charles J. Buckley (University of Scranton)

Group 2. Business Curriculum Accreditation
Chairman: Thomas J. Bryde (Iona College)
Resource: George F. Grauel (John Carroll University)
Robert F. Berner (State University of New York at Buffalo)
Recorder: Rev. John F. O'Brien (Seton Hall University)

Group 3. Education Curriculum Accreditation
Chairman: Lynn W. Eley (Washington University)
Resource: Arthur L. Assum (University of Rochester)
Grover L. Angel (The George Washington University)

Group 4. Student Personnel Services
Chairman: Mary T. Egginton (Adelphi University)
Resource: Sherman V. N. Kent (Rider College)
Joseph H. Strain (Suffolk University)
Recorder: William F. Kelly (University of Louisville)

Group 5. Admission and Retention
Chairman: Peter Meyer (Queens College, New York)
Resource: Brother Francis Emery (LaSalle College)
Rev. Richard T. Deters (Xavier University)
Recorder: Richard D. Robbins (The Johns Hopkins University)

Group 6. Administrative Development of Personnel
Chairman: Robert E. Sharer (Michigan State University)
Resource: James G. Brown (The George Washington University)
Thomas A. Emmet (University of Detroit)
Recorder: David H. Mangnall (Newark College of Engineering)

12:30-1:30 PM Luncheon

2:00-3:30 PM General Session

RELATIONS WITH TOMORROW

Chairman: Edwin H. Spengler (Brooklyn College)

Panel:

George H. Daigneault (University of California)
Hyman Lichtenstein (Hofstra University)
Richard A. Matre (Loyola University, Chicago)
Ernest E. McMahon (Rutgers, The State University)
Milton R. Stern (New York University)

5:45-6:45 PM Social Hour

7:30 PM Annual AUEC Banquet, Student Center Ballroom, Southern Methodist University

Chairman: John M. Claunch (Southern Methodist University)

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 28

8:30-1:00 PM Committee Meetings

WELCOMING REMARKS

by

KEITH BAKER

VICE PRESIDENT, SOUTHERN METHODIST UNIVERSITY

On behalf of Southern Methodist University and its president, Dr. Willis M. Tate, it is a great pleasure to welcome you. This is at the same time a very old country and a very new country. We are finding artifacts which reveal the presence of men many thousands of years ago. The Spaniards came to our land 400 years ago and, in Texas, we have known the flags of six nations. Yet we are a relatively new state and we are relatively new in the educational world.

Southern Methodist University celebrates its fiftieth anniversary this year, a respectable age for a university in our region, but youthful as one considers the universities of our country and of the world. I had our youthful status brought to my attention when I represented SMU on the occasion of the inauguration of President Kingman Brewster, of Yale University. The academic procession formed in the order of antiquity. First was Arthur L. Goodhart of Oxford University, a university founded in 1167. Then came Jacques Poujol of the University of Paris, an educational institution founded in 1170. Ten men later came the first American University, Harvard, founded in 1636. Then came the representatives of the universities founded in the seventeenth century, the eighteenth century, the nineteenth century, and ultimately, 136 representatives after Monsieur Poujol came myself, representing SMU in 1915, and I was followed by eighteen other representatives of newer institutions.

As this great occasion took place, I was thinking that all of these institutions, young and old, once had a beginning, and I was chuckling over an anecdote which I had heard only a short time before. Prior to his inauguration, President Kingman Brewster of Yale had come to Dallas with, as he called them, his "flying circus" a contingent of four professors from Yale to meet with the alumni on the SMU campus. At one of their meetings, Professor George Pearson, a history professor, had given the Yale alumni a brief history of Yale, and he told this story. When Yale College was founded, he said the State of Connecticut gave the new college some money, the city of New Haven gave some money, and Mr. Elihu Yale gave some books. The new college, therefore, could have been named Connecticut College, but it was decided to name it Yale College in the hope that Mr. Yale would give some more books and perhaps some money. "Then," said Professor Pearson, "the graceless scamp died intestate." This anecdote reminded me that the path of true education has never been a smooth one.

In the State of Texas, we have 93 Colleges and Universities, some small, some large, and some medium in size. They vary in their academic capacity, in their endowment, and in their dream of the future. But there is a great stir of interest and determination on the part of Texas to improve our educational capacity, and the governor of our state has proved his serious purpose of making education a major part of his program. I cannot speak for all of the educational institutions, I can speak only for SMU, but, perhaps, in speaking for one I shall speak for all when I say that, in my estimation, we are trying to carry out an ideal stated best in a recent article in the *Atlantic Monthly* by John Beinard. Mr. Beinard said: "Education in America should provide an equal opportunity for individuals to become unequal as rapidly as their own innate ability and determination will allow." Certainly this is an objective which the evening colleges of our country are helping its citizens to achieve.

Again may I say, welcome to our community, our university, and our state. I hope your visit will be one you will long remember.

PART II
PRESENTATIONS

THE EVENING COLLEGE:
UNIVERSITY AND COMMUNITY RELATIONS

RAYMOND P. WITTE

DIRECTOR EVENING DIVISION, LOYOLA UNIVERSITY, NEW ORLEANS

A little boy was arrested for stealing. The court discovered that this was not his first offense. Nevertheless, he was paroled to a police sergeant. The officer told him he would have to attend church every Sunday and after school on Mondays report to the station and tell what had gone on in Church. On his first visit the boy was asked if he had attended church the day before.

Yep, he replied.

What was the text of the sermon?

I knew you were going to ask me that so I memorized it.

The Preacher got up in the pulpit and said, "don't worry you will get your quilt back."

The puzzled policeman said, "Kid, I have taught Sunday School for fourteen years and have read the bible from cover to cover seven times and I have never heard the statement "Don't worry, you'll get your quilt back."

If you don't believe me phone the reverend and find out.

He did and was told, "Fear thee not, thy comforter shall return."

There is a moral to this story. Everyone interprets the things they hear and read in the light of their own experiences. That is what I shall attempt to do this afternoon. Teaching school is the only way I have made my living. I have been doing it for 37 years. I taught eight years in elementary schools, eight years in secondary schools and twenty-one years in various universities. My institution, Loyola University of the South, is a charter member of AUEC and to my knowledge has been represented at every AUEC Convention. I have been Director of the Evening Division for fourteen years and have had six years of prior teaching experience in Evening Colleges. Therefore, from the viewpoint of this experience I am going to attempt to key-note this convention. Since membership in AUEC is limited to institutions whose Evening Divisions grant credit toward degrees, I am going to limit my remarks to the framework of credit programs. I am sure that my remarks will not be universally accepted. Since they will be interpreted in light of your own experiences, my only hope is that I get an approximate fifty-fifty split. This division should contribute to the success of this convention.

My membership in AUEC has been a rewarding one. It has given me more help and satisfaction than any other professional organization of which I am a member. Yet it is not my intention to praise AUEC but rather to point out areas in which I think it has failed.

The theme of this Convention is The Evening College: University and Community Relations. Without attempting to exhaust the subject, I would like to treat six different communities: AUEC members; University Administrators; Day Faculty; part-time faculty; adult student body and prospective students.

I believe that the greatest need of Adult education is prestige in the academic world. I believe that we have failed to achieve this goal not only nationally for the field of adult education but even individually on our own campuses. I feel that the demonstrated reluctance of AUEC to join with NUEA into one adult education organization stems from the fact that in the academic world we enjoy more prestige than NUEA members. I believe that this problem of prestige is more real than we sometimes care to admit. When I was on the Board of Directors we had a meeting in Brooklyn. We did not hold the sessions in the hotel but alternated between Brooklyn College and Pratt Institute. When kidded about this arrangement, both Ed Spengler and Bernie Reed admitted that they did it because of the prestige involved. They felt that introductions to key faculty members and an informal lunch with administrators enhanced their own position on their own campus. If such an arrangement could add to the stature of men like Spengler and Reed think what a visit from a far away Dean could mean to me. Ed Spengler once said that he favored some sort of program of visitation. This would not be in the nature of an inspection but just a friendly prearranged visit where an informal meal with a couple of administrators would be arranged. Such visits would make our job of missionaries working among unbelieving administrators and faculty members an easier one. I do know that such a visit would have helped me. There were times when I was almost desperate for such help. But it is not something you ask for. It has always been incomprehensible to me that despite the fact that my institution is a charter member of this organization and has been represented at every national convention, no member of AUEC, NUEA, or the Center has ever visited my campus. Howell McGee and I were asked to visit Louisiana State University in New Orleans to make recommendations on its application for admission to membership in AUEC. We had pleasant discussions with key administrators. Several months later, the Chancellor of this institution, Dr. Homer Hitt, told me that he was really impressed with what we had told him of our organization. Such visits do have an effect and I think, in this regard AUEC has failed me miserably.

Secondly, I believe that we have developed some good literature but have failed to enunciate a solid philosophy of adult education. My first convention was in Atlanta and I came home from it with one basic idea. It was that the adult student should be judged solely on his ability to do the work. Since then I have used the statement a thousand times. But I still don't know if this is basic AUEC philosophy or not. Certainly, I am unable to prove it to my Administrators. I do know that the problem clinics prove that all of us put it into practice. Other conventions have yielded other nuggets like: Adults are different, the mature student brings more to the classroom, the closer we resemble a day college the less effective we become in adult education, the Evening College offers an ideal area for experimentation. But as I listen to my fellow members I get the feeling that such homely philosophy is reserved for convention consumption.

Admittedly, in an organization as diverse as ours we will never find unanimity on any set of practices. Nor should we expect to find it. But I do think it is imperative that we give voice to some fundamental concepts in adult education. We should see to it that we missionaries have the proper tools. It is embarrassing to have to prove your point by bringing along half a bushel of pamphlets and back issues of the Proceedings. It is not too convincing to show that out of 150 members 87 responded to the question and out of that number 32 do it the way you want to do it. I have found that our statistics lead to very few baptisms.

Let us now take a look at the Evening College and the University Administrators. We have certainly had enough conferences and speeches on the obligation of the University to the needs of the Community and to the needs of adult education. We all agree that the University should commit itself to a full program of adult education. But back home how much progress have we made? I am afraid that it is very little. I know this is true in my own institution. The strongest statement made in support of my program was made recently when my President, Rev. Andrew Smith, S.J., said that the Evening Division was and should remain a real service to the community. But this does not mean that my institution has committed itself to this program in the same manner that it has to others. Our Evening Division has an enrollment of 700 students. All of them are in credit programs. Our division offers its own degrees in Arts and Sciences and Business Administration. It hires its own faculty, conducts its own registration, does all of the academic counselling, operates a program of extracurricular activities and offers a few other student services. I administer this program with myself as a part-time Director (I teach two classes during the day) and one full-time secretary. That is all. Without volunteer student help we could not operate. When I asked for additional secretarial assistance my division was psychoanalyzed. Two members of the faculty from the School of Business Administration were asked to run an efficiency check on my office. They spent hours talking to me and to my secretary. Their report stated that we had enough work to justify an additional secretary at half time. But they also added that no additional help would be needed if we cut down on the services offered to the students. I never got the help and neither did I curtail the services. Yet these two men were members of the faculty in the School of Business Administration on my own campus. That school has a Dean, an Administrative Assistant and three full-time secretaries to handle a student body that is slightly less than half of mine. It is difficult to convince Administrators that a part-time student requires as many pieces of paper as a full-time student and that it is often more time consuming to administer to the needs of part-time students than full-time students. Under conditions such as this it is easy to see that my institution is not wholeheartedly committed to adult education. We all know of examples among our own membership where such situations are not only common but what is worse Evening College credits are not recognized by the parent institution. We are a long way from winning the war.

The fewest number of converts to our philosophy is found in the day faculty. One of our confreres at the Anglo-American meeting at Oxford this past summer stated that we have made great strides in interesting day faculty in adult education. He said, "Twenty years ago they were hostile. Today they are indifferent." I think that the day faculty has been more successful in winning us over to their sect than we have to ours. In our desire for campus respectability we have accepted more of their demands than they have ours. At the present time, for all practical purposes, many of our Evening Colleges are duplicates or extensions of the day divisions. This is so true that I sometimes facetiously think the best solution to our problems is to give in all the way to day demands. Then we can abandon our Evening Colleges to the tender mercies of the day faculty while we start over with a new division designed exclusively for the academically illegitimate and nonconforming adult. We can even make the break complete and award special diploma inscribed with a bar sinister. Still in a facetious vein I think the community would accept our new diploma because our prestige in the community is at an all time high. It is from the tongue and the pen of the day faculty that we suffer. But I don't think we should feel too badly about this. After all, the thinking of day faculty is completely oriented around the day students. They interpret everything in the light of day experiences. Even we who are half-time day faculty and half-time evening administrators have to constantly guard against falling into day patterns of thought. We have to periodically divest ourselves of such thinking about as often and in the same way as we defrost a refrigerator. That is why I have always found AUEC meetings so stimulating. They lay bare the brain washing I have been undergoing for a year.

In this discussion of the Evening College and University and Community relations, the real poor relation has been the part-time instructor. Despite the fact that our evening colleges depend on the part-time instructor, AUEC has failed to defend him. When the American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business made the unreasonable demand that we add a specified number of terminal degree instructors to the Evening College faculty, we panicked. In the hue and cry that followed I did not hear one word in defense of the old stand-by, the part-time instructor. I believe we feel a little reluctant to defend him because he is often the target of much of the static from the day faculty. Therefore, I shall digress a moment to speak in his behalf.

Teaching is the only profession in which real competence cannot be measured. It is the profession that has the widest gap between what ought-to-be-done and what-can-be-got-away-with. In our attempt to secure good teachers we have become dependent on pieces of paper and have forgotten our fundamental philosophy, "The ability to do the work." The teaching profession has even manufactured the myth that good teaching is directly related to research and that without research there is no good teaching. In my thirty-seven years in the classroom I have failed to detect any relationship between good teaching and research. I know some good researchers who are mighty poor teachers just as I know some mighty good teachers who are totally uninterested in research. In my undergraduate days I had an instructor who had done some research on the Thirty Years War. As far as I could see the only difference it made was that his students then got more Thirty Years War and less Louis XIV. All of it in an uninspired manner. A good teacher is one who can retail knowledge in such a way that it inspires the students to pursue the subject on their own. Since his job is to whet the appetite, the inspiration is more important than the retailing. I wonder how many of our present day professors could survive in the old system where the only income was the tuition paid directly to the instructor. I know a lot of them who would be on relief. I also know a lot of part-time instructors who would get rich.

Right now run through the full-time faculty on your day campus. How many of them do you label dull, undedicated and uninspiring. There is no need for us to be on the defensive when these same words are hurled at the part-time instructor. Hurl them back. I did that several months ago and thereby silenced a critic. Our Admissions Committee was overhauling the admission requirements. I am a member of the committee. The subject under discussion was the use of Summer School grades to remove probation. One officer of the university objected to the use of these grades because most of the students took a particular speech class and all students in that class got grades of A. Five minutes later the same man began low-rating the teaching in the Evening Division. I challenged him to name names. I reminded him of the speech instructor who taught exclusively in the day school. I offered to match him good teacher for good teacher and bad teacher for bad teacher and to bet that I would come out ahead. It silenced him. All of us condemn poor teaching. It is not true, by any standard, that we have a monopoly of it.

I have found part-time instructors just as dedicated as any in the profession. For years our Evening Division operated with unpaid instructors. A small honorarium was finally given so that it would be less embarrassing to fire undesirables. I have one part-time man on my faculty that has been teaching for thirty-three years, all of it part-time, half of it without pay. Where else can you find such dedication. Since I still pay a nominal honorarium of $100.00 per semester hour taught, I am sure that none of my instructors teach for the money involved. And yet, I am sure you too, have a real good part-time faculty. I once made the statement that by the very process of elimination the part-time instructor becomes as good if not better than the full-time faculty. Not bound by rules of tenure and not having contracts with the part-time instructors, I am able to eliminate the poor ones and by this process get good ones. The good ones that stay, and they are many, are real dedicated men. They may not be considered experts in their field but give them the material and they will render an inspired job of retailing it. What more can you ask of a teacher, day or night?

Our fifth community is our own student body. The members of AUEC have done a marvelous job of accommodating the adult students who wanted to earn a degree at night. We have done it in the face of ridicule, caustic criticism, lack of total support from the University and a host of other obstacles. I heard one dean say that the big problem of operating an Evening College was that everybody was tired. He backed this up by saying that even the mice that were furnished him were too tired to go through the maze. We can really be proud of our students and our graduates. But if I am right in thinking that statements like Adults are different, the ability to do the work, the Evening College is an ideal area for experimentation, is part of AUEC philosophy, then we have failed our students. If the Evening College is simply an extension of day school, then how do we satisfy the needs of the adult student who is different from the day student. If we believe that the only criterion for admission should be the ability to do the work, how do we justify admission requirements that are little different from those designed for new high school graduates? If we are an ideal area for experimentation, list the experiments we have undertaken. We all know of some but how many fingers would be needed to count those that have been undertaken by the one hundred and fifty institutions represented here today. I myself have not wandered out of sight of the traditional credit offerings. I feel that this also applies to the majority of you. My only excuse for negligence in this area is that with only one secretary and my half-time services I have all I can do to take care of the status quo. What your excuse is I don't know but I do feel that in the absence of widespread experimentation in the field of adult education we have failed our students.

I think we have also failed our prospective students. We can easily lull ourselves into thinking that we have done a good job and then be rudely awakened. This happened to both John Dyer and myself. For years the Evening Colleges of both Tulane and Loyola rocked along with a steady slow growth. Our complacency was shattered in September, 1958, when Louisiana State University opened a day campus in New Orleans. John Dyer and I tried to guess the results of a possible third Evening College in our city. We had five years to fret about it. In 1963 LSUNO opened its Evening Division. Tulane University charges $21,00 per semester hour, Loyola University charges $18.00 a semester hour and the advertised rates for LSUNO were between $6.00 and 8.00 per semester hour depending on the number taken. In the face of this philanthropy what happened? In their first registration LSUNO enrolled over 700 students. At the same time both Tulane and Loyola saw an increase of approximately 10%. This proves that LSUNO was furnishing a need that neither Tulane nor Loyola were offering. The fact that in a metropolitan area of over 1,000,000 people there are less than 5000 adults enrolled in undergraduate and graduate Evening credit programs prove that the three local institutions are still failing the prospective students. I can't answer all of the whys of this situation but I think it is clearly demonstrated that our institutions are not wholly committed to the adult educational needs of our community.

There seems to be a preoccupation among us about drop-outs. It is one problem that has never interested me. The average adult comes to the Evening College with a fairly good idea of what he wants. If he does not get what he comes for, he quits. If the demand for what he wanted justifies it, we make the addition or the change. When we satisfy his needs, he stays. But we must remember that if we truly educate those who stay, we are simply preparing them to leave. The two characteristic marks of an educated person are a realization of his own ignorance and a will to learn. If a person does not have them, he is not educated regardless of the number of letters he can trail behind his name. Education is frustrating in that the more we learn the less we know. Each new avenue we explore opens new ones of which we were previously ignorant. If we couple to this growing realization of ignorance a will to learn, we are truly educated. To the students to whom we give this gift we can proudly bid them goodbye. They are not drop-outs. They are the end product of a good education, whether we gave them this gift in their first or fifteenth year in our Evening College.

I would like to conclude this rather negative approach with some positive recommendations.

1. I suggest a well documented defense of the part-time Instructor. He has received some undeserved accusations from our fellow professionals. It is up to us to defend him since we are the ones who created him. In many instances he is doing *a superior job of retailing knowledge. Since he will continue to be with us in increasing numbers the least we can do is give him our vote of confidence.*

2 - AUEC should establish a permanent secretariat. We cannot build a national image or have national effect with a part-time secretary and a roving presidency.

3 - We should prepare a manifesto of our fundamental philosophy. I am sure that we can come to some agreement on the ideals of adult education regardless of how we may differ in their application. I think this manifesto should be prepared for widespread distribution in a folder no larger than the one giving the history of AUEC as prepared last year by Ed. Spengler.

4 - We should develop some system of visitation. I do not have in mind any type of inspection but I do believe that a system of visitation authorized by the officers of this association would increase the number of converts among our university administrators. One informal meal where the conversation can be maneuvered onto the subject of adult education can do more good than a year of work by ourselves. I believe that such meetings should be more than a casual unannounced visit. They should be formal enough to allow time for making appointments with key university personnel but as far as the invited guests are concerned it can appear as a casual visit. I do know that such a system would work wonders for me.

5 - We should attempt some national publicity on the aims and objectives of AUEC. For the most part our literature has been prepared for home consumption. It is time for us to tell the story of adult education to the general public. I feel so strongly about this that I hereby make a firm offer to this assembly. If you think that AUEC has a fundamental philosophy on adult education that should be told to the general public, I volunteer to do the telling.

Loyola University of the South totally owns and operates radio station WWL. It is one of the top ten clear channel stations in the country. It literally covers the nation. I have made frequent use of the station and have received comments on the programs from as far away as Alaska and Hawaii. If we prepare a statement for general consumption radio station WWL will release it during prime time. Our Public Relations Department will then distribute the tape to the 47 radio stations throughout the country that subscribe to this service.

Furthermore, Loyola University totally owns and operates the commercial television station Channel 4. It, like the radio station, is the only CBS outlet in New Orleans. If AUEC feels that it has a message for national consumption, Channel 4 will make, free of charge, according to our guidance a documentary TV film. If we give them the raw material, they will script it and produce it from beginning to end at no cost to us. When the film is completed Channel 4 will show it once in New Orleans and then donate the film to AUEC. If AUEC would like additional copies of the film, Channel 4 will supply them at cost. The cost per film will run between $50.00 to a $100.00. Once AUEC has the film, individual members can make the necessary arrangements for local showings of the film.

I am hereby asking the Board of Directors of AUEC to act on this offer. If it is found acceptable, then I ask our President to appoint a committee or assign the task to an existing committee to determine the material for this documentary. Whenever necessary Channel 4, at its own expense will send staff members to meet with the committee. I have all of the necessary permission to produce this show. The rest is up to you.

As I said in the beginning, the best thing I could hope for in this session is that half of you disagree with me. I do hope that my remarks contribute to the success of this convention.

RELATIONS WITH TOMORROW

CHAIRMAN: *Edwin H. Spengler,* Brooklyn College

PANELISTS: *George H. Daigneault,* University of California
Hyman Lichtenstein, Hofstra University
Ernest E. McMahon, Rutgers, The State University
Milton R. Stern, New York University

RECORDER: *Thomas B. Nickson,* State University of New York at Buffalo

Chairman Spengler opened the session with the following remarks:

"When deans and directors come together to discuss the future of the evening college, it becomes apparent that what each one sees in the crystal ball is colored, in part, by his own institutional setting and educational environment. As might be expected, this results in sharp differences of opinion concerning changing patterns and the evaluation of such developments. There are those who stoutly support the thesis that evening colleges should limit their activities to credit programs leading to a degree, while others insist that the trend must be toward a rapid expansion of non-degree-credit offerings at the expense of degree-credit programs. Some observe that the evening colleges are attracting a more mature clientele, calling for special programs and teaching techniques. Their critics maintain that evening students are in the same general age range as the day undergraduates, and, therefore, require no exceptional treatment. We are also aware of the conflict between the advocates of greater autonomy and independent action and those who are struggling to become 'fully institutionalized within the university.'

"These opposing views will probably never be reconciled because of the fact that the very heterogeneity of our publics and variations in geographical areas would seem to justify any one of these approaches. In other words, there are social pressures for degree work for part-time students, but there is also a widespread interest in college-level offerings outside the degree framework. Many 'young adults' seek admission to evening colleges, but a sizeable proportion of the older age group is also concerned with continuing education. While greater freedom and flexibility are sought in introducing curricular innovations, the social demands for certification and accreditation inevitably result in placing certain programs under strict faculty surveillance. There is no single formula that will apply; many types of institutions (including day and evening colleges, extension divisions and community colleges) will be required to meet the needs of our complex economy.

"On some points, however, there is common agreement. Few would argue with the proposition that the evening college must respond to changing conditions and continue to be aware of the shifting educational needs of society. It should provide leadership and support for worthwhile experiments and projects that bridge the gap between the university and its local community. To play an active role in higher education, it must have a clear set of objectives and a sense of commitment. Finally, to be successful in its operations, it must have the cooperation, understanding, and wholehearted support of the entire university."

He then called upon each of the panelists for a five-minute presentation of his point of view. Each member of the panel had contributed an essay which appeared in A LIVE OPTION: *The Future of the Evening College* edited by Kenneth Haygood (Notes and Essays on Education for Adults 46), Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, Boston University, 1965. Therefore, each either summarized the point of view he had expressed in his essay or made a few additional remarks which expanded the stand he had already taken.

Mr. Matre stated that the evening college, as we know it today, is heading for obsolescence. It is facing a crisis. The subjects offered and the procedures followed five years, ten years, or a generation ago are no longer appropriate. College education on a part-time basis for a certain segment of our society is here and will continue to remain. For some it will be obtained during day-school hours, for others in the evening. The entire university must accept the responsibility for serving the needs of this group of students. Which division of a university serves these students is not important. What happens to them -- what they are going to be taught and in what manner -- should be of major concern.

Mr. McMahon indicated that there was substantial agreement among the members of the panel on many points. Proceeding upon the assumption that most of the audience had read his essay, he enumerated three additional generalizations: (1) both credit and non-credit courses are here to stay, (2) there will continue to be evening classes, and (3) as long as there are evening classes, someone will teach them. Particulars regarding each of these three generalizations must, and will, vary from institution to institution. He stated that we should be concerned with both power and resources. The concern over power relates to evening colleges maintaining their positions within the structure of their institutions and expanding their realms in accordance with their objectives and desires. The concern over resources is related to that over power, but really is the need to command whatever funds are necessary to accomplish the objectives we set for ourselves. He declared that evening colleges have problems, but indicated that when there are no problems there will be no need for administrators since "finding resources, bridging gaps, and developing new and successful programs are the reasons the institutions employ us."

Mr. Daigneault remarked that the job which evening colleges are doing at present is *not* meeting many of the *real* needs of our society. He implied that many aspects of night-school education should be thoroughly studied. Among them should be who is the best qualified teacher of adult students. It could be that persons whose full-time positions are in industry or business, rather than in education, but who hold terminal degrees are those who should be teaching evening college classes. In many cases the curricula themselves are not proper or challenging for adults. Courses for adults should serve two purposes simultaneously: (1) meet degree requirements, and (2) prepare those completing them to aid in solving some of the long-range problems of our society like urban renewal and water pollution. He stated that, at present, meeting needs like these in an innovative and imaginative manner is "lacking among all of us."

Mr. Lichtenstein began by reminding the group of three major issues AUEC members identified as those with which they felt evening colleges would have to cope: (1) finding sufficient resources to meet the demands for more degree and non-degree courses, (2) bridging the gap between the specialist and the non-specialist, and (3) developing new programs which will enable individuals to understand and deal with emerging problems of our society. He stated that he felt certain that those in evening college work would continue to respond to challenges in the future as they have in the past -- happily, hopefully, internally, and instinctively. Among the problems which confront us at the moment he named civil rights, urbanization, problems of the aging, the education of women, and graduate work on a part-time basis.

Mr. Stern commented that he felt that in the future the credit function of the evening college would become more absorbed into the mainstream of the university, the part-time student would become more orthodox, and instruction in the evening college would be more uniform with that of day schools. He stated that he thought more non-credit courses would be demanded by adults seeking continuing education. One such group would be those persons holding professional degrees. He remarked that he was confident that evening colleges could adapt to meet new challenges since, in his opinion, their format -- far from being solidified or calcified -- had not even jelled as yet.

The session was then opened for comments and/or questions from members of the audience. Father Deters asked what the essence of the difference between Matre and Daigneault was.

Mr. Matre stated that he agreed that the evening college must respond to change, but that he wanted to build upon what had already been accomplished. He felt that the evening college must work within the framework of the entire university. He classified himself as a realist, Daigneault as an idealist, "perhaps."

Mr. Daigneault maintained that, although the evening college program must faithfully reflect the purposes and goals of the entire university, it had a specific role to play as the representative of a large body of human beings crying out for assistance in many academic areas. He emphasized that the evening college had to be creative and innovative in providing this assistance and implied that for this reason, perhaps credit work should be lessened or dropped.

Chairman Spengler questioned whether academic work could not also be handled in an innovative manner. He stated that, in his opinion, Daigneault's and McMahon's points of view were opposites. He concluded by saying, "The whole university will bridge the gap, meet the needs, etc. Credit and non-credit both will remain. Part-time students should continue to have the opportunity to obtain college degrees."

Mr. Siegle stated that the two points of view expressed were reconcilable, perhaps, if terms were ignored. He suggested that the word "evening" should be dropped from the discussion and that "credit" and "non-credit" should be retained.

Mr. Matre said that he agreed that there would be two operations in the future. He maintained that, although some still insist that evening colleges should strive to be different from day schools, the latter are also imaginative and creative. In his opinion, the entire university will have to adapt to changing conditions and demands.

Mr. Stern pointed out that the range in ages of the clientele of the evening college is a prime contributor to our problem -- that we are dealing with *three* separate generations who are in conflict with each other: the young, the middle, and the old. This fact should influence the structure of the university. Young adults have been those working toward degrees, while continuing education in the liberal arts has been sought by older people. He stated that those desiring professional-type courses should probably be working with graduate and professional schools. For these reasons he felt that a *multiplicity of structure* should receive attention.

Mr. Baker stated that on a continuum from "least creative to most creative" undergraduate day schools would be listed first, evening colleges second, and business and industry third. He suggested that in the future business and industry could very well assume a much more prominent role in educating adults than it has to date.

Chairman Spengler indicated that in the future we should forget the structure and concentrate upon the *function*. This approach could, possibly, solve the problem.

Mr. Lichtenstein stated that far too often we use "lack of resources" as a dodge. We find it convenient to use this phrase as a cloak behind which to hide when someone comes up with an innovative or creative idea. This is easier than doing something. He indicated that in most cases, with a little imagination and a *lot of will*, there are adequate resources.

During the discussion which followed it was pointed out that, historically, the evening college has been one arm of a university which could cut across the entire university structure. The question was raised as to whether or not having the evening college follow the patterns of other operating divisions was being advocated. It was stated that the evening college can solve the problems and fill the needs of all kinds of people. Studies are beginning to show that the belief that credit courses are more interesting and attractive to adults than non-credit may be another "myth."

Mr. Matre pointed out that many persons may need the *content* of a degree program, rather than a degree itself, to become leaders in solving community problems. He also stressed the fact that we educate a *person*, not a group -- that education is a very personal thing.

Mr. Daigneault agreed that evening colleges have purposes to fulfill and goals to achieve that may be more important than offering degree programs. He suggested that we give these our attention.

Mr. McMahon advocated that we must decide upon the purpose(s) of a specific evening college and university. Having made this decision, we must then determine how to carry out, *more effectively*, the purpose(s) which we have established and how to use our present resources to obtain additional resources. He stated that the latter is a problem of structure and organization.

Mr. Stern advanced the thought that we must have *at least* one open-ended arm of a university. This possibly could be the evening and/or extension division.

Mr. Lichtenstein maintained that the problem of mobilization of resources has *nothing* to do with structure and organization, but is, rather, a matter of determination and will. Mr. Russell Smith disagreed and said that, whenever we need something new, we do *not* mobilize resources, but go out and create them.

Chairman Spengler stated that, to date, we have *refused* to be obliterated and that this same determination to survive will probably continue. He raised a question regarding the future of the committee assigned to study future directions of the evening college. The members present directed the committee to continue its work.

Father Deters raised questions concerning the future of the university in relation to the influence of the federal government and business and industry. It was suggested that perhaps the whole spectrum of university responsibilities will be covered in the future, in a specific urban area, by having various institutions of higher education in the locale serve different functions.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN TITLE I OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

KENNETH HAYGOOD

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS

It was suggested by Kenneth Haygood, and the editor agreed, that due to the lapse of time between his remarks, delivered in Dallas on October 25, 1965, and the publication of the **PROCEEDINGS**, most of what was said would be outdated information and no significant purpose would be served by including the detailed comments in this publication.

Preceding the United States Office of Education regional briefing meetings by several weeks, Kenneth Haygood's remarks were very timely, alerted those present to the regional briefing meetings, and enlightened the AUEC membership regarding developments in Title I. AUEC is indebted to Kenneth Haygood for a valuable and timely presentation.

PART III

DISCUSSION SESSIONS

A. Special Interests
B. Problem Clinics

A. SPECIAL INTEREST SESSIONS

RELATIONS WITH THE UNIVERSITY

STUDENT RELATIONS

CHAIRMAN: *Martha L. Farmer,* City College of New York
RESOURCE: *Clarence H. Thompson,* Drake University
Walter H. Hayes, Jr., University of Maryland
RECORDER: *Howard W. Benfield,* Drexel Institute of Technology

The classification of students was the first topic to be discussed. It was generally agreed that better relations can be established with students who are pursuing a program lasting a period of years, probably leading to a degree, than with students who are taking non-credit courses "cafeteria style." The latter are present for a limited period of time, and therefore lack the stronger attachment or opportunities for involvement that characterize those students who are in college for a period of years. Although all personnel services should be available to the student taking non-credit courses, it is obvious that the long-term student provides a more fertile field for the development of leadership.

Several members of the group reported that they are conducting broad programs in student activities to include a student council or association, chapters of technical societies such as S.A.M., special interest clubs, and social affairs which in some instances include children and wives. Although slow to develop, it is expected that the international organization of student councils will strongly influence the growth of this phase of college life.

Perhaps the most critical problem is that of finding a suitable time for such activities. In most instances it was found that the evening student, particularly in the urban areas, was in a great rush at the end of classes to catch his train or bus and to get home to his family, as well as to get a good night's rest in preparation for the demands of his job the next day.

Although several colleges reported some success in combining day and evening college events, it was generally felt that this procedure presented difficulties due to the differences in interests, age, and other factors.

It appears that the combining of day and evening student activities had the greatest measure of success in colleges that have a student union building where space for workshops and various types of activity is available. In such instances the student program board is frequently composed of both day and evening students. This development has worked successfully at

Drexel Institute where day and evening students have planned programs for the student center which include not only day and evening students, but children and wives as well. It was reported that combined committees of day and evening students have met with success at Western Reserve. A representative of the University of Buffalo reported that although day and evening programs are quite independent of each other, and liaison is needed, the over-all results are satisfactory.

Another topic of interest, discussed at some length, was the effect of automation on evening students. Although it was agreed that the effects of automation related, generally, to registration, billing, and scheduling, it was felt that personnel workers have an added incentive to develop stronger programs of counseling and extra curricular activities.

There was common agreement among the members of this group that meetings, such as the one reported here, where problems and solutions may be shared and discussed, are highly contributory to sound program development. The analysis of problems common to all was approached in a serious vein, and with a singleness of purpose. As one member of the group expressed it, "We are dedicated to this purpose, or we would not be here."

EVENING FACULTY RELATIONS

CHAIRMAN: *Stanley J. Gwiazda,* Drexel Institute of Technology
RESOURCE: *Marvin E. Hartig,* Evansville College
Dominic A. LaRusso, University of Washington
RECORDER: *Dee Lyons,* University of Louisville

Discussion in this group was devoted, almost exclusively, to certain administrative procedures related to the evening college and its faculty members at Evansville College and the University of Washington, as outlined by Marvin E. Hartig, and Dominic A. LaRusso respectively.

At Evansville College the dean of the evening program, working cooperatively with department heads, schedules the evening classes and appoints the members of the teaching faculty. The dean is responsible for faculty class assignments, and salaries. Evansville College has an evening enrollment of 1800 students, and forty-five per cent of the faculty is from the day program.

During the fall quarter there were approximately 26,000 day students, and 5,800 evening students at the University of Washington. Thirty-five per cent of the faculty is comprised of personnel from business and industry; the remaining sixty-five per cent is from the full-time day faculty. Faculty appointments are recommended to the dean of the evening college by department chairmen. If the dean concurs, he forwards the recommendations to the vice president who, in turn, discusses the appointments with the president of the university.

At both Evansville College and the University of Washington rapport among part-time and full-time faculty members, and the administration was reported as being excellent. At both institutions faculty members are excited about teaching in the evening program, and look forward to a long teaching future in this area.

The group concluded its meeting with a discussion revolving around the part-time faculty member, and expressed a desire to see more time devoted to this subject at future A.U.E.C. conventions.

UNIVERSITY RELATIONS (Faculty and Administration)

CHAIRMAN: *Gurth I. Abercrombie,* Northeastern University
RESOURCE: *Rev. Gerald A. Sugrue, S.J.,* University of San Francisco
Carl H. Elliott, Purdue University
RECORDER: *Franklin A. Power,* Boston University

Although the participants indicated significant differences in the administrative structure of their universities, they appeared to be in agreement regarding the identity of common problems and the approaches to their solution. The following is a summary of their observations.

In order to maintain effective relationships with the university faculty and administration, the dean of the evening college must keep constantly in mind the historical background of the institution and its internal inter-relationships. Viewed from this perspective one may discern a trend of acceptance of the evening college as contrasted with the view formerly held that it was "marginal and peripheral." One's approach to establishing a climate of increasing acceptance will, of course, depend upon the existing attitudes of the day faculty and administration.

Among the administrative problems to be dealt with are the organizational structure patterns. On the one hand, there is the rôle played by the administration which may tend to be pragmatic, and on the other, that of the academic community which may be inflexible in its outlook, and suspicious of the validity of part-time education. Within this structure one must, somehow, define the role of evening college.

In this, the attitude of the president of the university will be important. Does he believe in the evening college? Does he view the evening college primarily as a community service, as a money maker, as an adult program, or as a "melting pot" for those who cannot make it in the daytime? Should it be autonomous, or should it draw from the total university? His attitude will also make itself felt in such problems as academic and administrative rank, allocation of university resources, and involvement of evening faculty and administration in over-all university planning.

In his relationships with the members of the day faculty, one must take into consideration the fact that some lack an understanding of the adult learner; and the heterogeneity of the evening faculty and students frequently leads the day faculty to question evening college standards. Some of these problems and misunderstandings might easily be resolved through better communications, and in-service faculty development.

Many suggestions concerning ways to improve relations with the day faculty and administration were advanced. In general, the suggestions centered around gaining their respect by the efficiency of the evening college operation, and the inclusion of the day faculty as teachers, guest lecturers, and advisers to evening students.

It was generally agreed that if the evening college is to project the proper image and win full acceptance, it must develop an effective statement of aims and objectives, and a plan for establishing satisfactory relationships with the day faculty and administration

---

COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGE RELATIONS

CHAIRMAN: *James R. Quimper*, University of Maryland
RESOURCE: *Howell W. McGee*, University of Oklahoma
Maurice J. O'Sullivan, Sacred Heart University
RECORDER: *Robert E. Chiles*, Hunter College

Four-year evening colleges are being affected by the proliferation of community, junior or two-year colleges which are playing a distinctive and increasingly important role. They are the least expensive and most accessible form of education for the first two years of college. They are sensitive to the needs of the community and can respond more readily to them. They provide a variety of opportunities for vocational and technical Preperation. They serve as a proving ground for students proceeding toward a baccalaureate degree.

Participants specified the foregoing as characteristic of community colleges. They further discussed and identified four important relationships between community and evening colleges.

ENROLLMENTS. As community colleges multiply, an initial decline in enrollments in evening colleges seems likely, especially among first and second year students. Students with advanced standing, however, should increase. The full capacity of both two- andfour-year colleges will be required to accommodate the coming flood of students. The pressure of numbers may lead some community colleges to raise their entrance standards and deny some students the opportunity to prove themselves. The appearance of new community college facilities may encourage non-credit adult education programs in additional communities.

CURRICULA. It is generally desirable for community and evening colleges to avoid duplication in their programs. The community college ought not to be merely an extension of high school. Conversely, it should not offer third and fourth year college courses. These courses, including the student's major, are the responsibility of the senior college. The offerings of the evening college increasingly should reflect the needs of third and fourth year students. New senior colleges which begin with the junior year may point the way to the future.

TRANSFERS. The transfer of students from two-to four-year colleges raises problems regarding vocational and technical courses and the credit value of two-year terminal programs. In general, senior colleges should accept credits from accredited two-year colleges and evaluate them on the same basis that is used for advanced standing transfers from senior colleges. Counseling is important to assist students to prepare to transfer. Superior students in two-year programs can be helped to avoid loss of time in extraneous courses. Systematically moving them into senior colleges, however, may impoverish the two-year programs.

INTERRELATIONSHIPS. Increasingly, the evening college will cultivate the community college student. Community and evening colleges should establish cooperative approaches to curriculum planning, transfer of credit, adult education programs, and the like. Evening colleges may help define a distinctive role for the two-year college by helping mark out the areas best suited to each and by avoiding the unnecessary duplication of courses offered to the community. It seems prudent to open membership in A.U.E.C. to properly accredited community colleges to assist in the development of these relationships.

RELATIONS WITH THE COMMUNITY

DEFINITION OF PUBLICS

CHAIRMAN: *William C. Huffman,* University of Louisville
RESOURCE: *Hamilton Stillwell,* Wayne State University
Donald L. Peets, Sir George William University
RECORDER: *Viers W. Adams,* University of Pittsburgh

It was pointed out that the United States is no longer a nation of rural areas, but rather a nation of cities and towns - the megalopolis is upon us. We are confronted with new and exacting demands from industry, and with civic, social, economic, and health problems of urban communities. It was felt that the evening college should endeavor to develop programs that would serve the needs of the community as well as to provide opportunities, both new and traditional, for the individual to continue his education. Many types of programs were suggested - credit, non-credit (perhaps exclusively extension), workshops, conferences and institutes, just to mention a few. But, it was pointed out, no one institution should attempt to do all of these things. Each should define its publics in terms of its own resources - its ability to do a quality job. Because of the magnitude of the task that lies ahead of us, it was suggested that the evening college endeavor to cooperate with other adult education agencies in the community, some of which are probably better able than the evening college to conduct certain kinds of programs. Detroit, Montreal, and St.Louis were cited as examples of communities that have already begun to pool their educational resources. Persons interested in the activities of the Higher Education Coordinating Council of St.Louis were advised to write to the Director, Dr. John Forbes, c/o Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri 63130.

ANTI-OBSOLESCENCE PROGRAMS

CHAIRMAN: *Kenneth Henninger*, Illinois Institute of Technology
RESOURCE: *Kingsley M. Wientge*, Washington University
Russell F.W. Smith, New York University
RECORDER: *Cecil L. Dobbins*, University of Akron

The chairman opened the session by giving a brief overview of the nature and extent of obsolescence. The manifestation of obsolescence in knowledge and skills, he said, is not limited to just a few specialized fields, but rather has become a broad-based problem affecting every citizen whether he is aware of it or not.

Educationally, the basic problem in combating obsolescence of skills may be stated as the cultivation of the incentive for continuing self-development in a field of knowledge. Provision for depreciation to combat obsolescence of physical facilities is a way of life in our industrial economy, so must it be a way of life for both individuals and industry in combating obsolescence of skills. It is estimated that, in some fields, a person with a college degree will have a depreciation of knowledge at the rate of 300 hours per year. This in turn means an investment of about six hours of learning per week just to keep current. The engineering curriculum of just five years ago has little semblance to the one of today.

Ideally, there would be no problem of obsolescence if our educational system, at all levels, produced truly educated individuals with the capability, determination, and diligence for continued self-education throughout life. Education is an attitude of mind, not a terminal degree. The greatest contribution to society will be the discovery of ways to motivate and nurture the quality of mind that continually renews itself through the pursuit of knowledge.

It was suggested by Russell F.W. Smith that not only must we up-date people, but we must also prepare them for change as well, from mechanical to electronic, from machine accounting to electric data processing. He further suggested that one of our basic problems is to find ways to so motivate the individual that he creates his own drive for continued education.

Edward D. Shanken of the Engineers Joint Council reported that the Council had received a Kettering grant to establish a clearing house for current course offerings in engineering. The Council is especially interested in interdisciplinary programs, and plans to work mostly with evening colleges. An analysis of students in this type program at Johns Hopkins University revealed that these students were well established in their jobs and represented an average age of thirty-seven in contrast with twenty-seven for those in degree programs. It is expected that Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 will provide some funds for new programs in this general area.

PROGRAMS FOR WOMEN

CHAIRMAN: *Adelaide H. Jones*, Drury College
RESOURCE: *Robert W. Shaw*, Queens College, North Carolina
James F. Baker, Boston University
RECORDER: *John P. Donahue*, Loyola University, Chicago

Although there is disagreement on the point of whether a special approach is needed in developing programs for women, a number of colleges and universities have initiated such programs. Adelaide H. Jones expressed the view that in many cases such special programs are needed, principally because the needs and motivations of women are different.

In the opinion of James F. Baker, special programs for women should be scheduled during the daytime hours and should include opportunities for independent study, seminars, and other special approaches. The administrator, he said, should first define the educational needs of women and then design programs to satisfy those needs. It may be necessary, he continued, to completely redesign a curriculum after an evaluation. Dr. Baker then gave a short summary of Mrs. Freda Goldman's recent publication, *A Turning To Take Next: Alternative Goals In The Education Of Women*, published by the Center For The Study Of Liberal Education For Adults.

A special program for women initiated at Queens College, North Carolina, was described by Robert W. Shaw. Queens College, he said, has made a major commitment to an evening program for continuing education for women. The program will call for total involvement, and will in the main, serve the well-educated women from higher-income families. Counseling will play a very significant role in the program which is completely non-credit. One of the first problems encountered at Queens College was the very real fears of many women relative to getting started in such a program. The administrators of special programs for women should be cognizant of these fears and design procedures to help women to overcome them.

Speaking strongly in favor of special programs for women, Mrs. Miller of Southern Methodist University, suggested that women be required to meet the discipline of education on its own ground.

CULTIVATION OF PUBLICS

CHAIRMAN: *Harry A. McGuff,* Indiana Central College
RESOURCE: *Rev. Eric O'Connor, S.J.,* Thomas More Institute
Lawrence C. Barden, Drexel Institute of Technology
RECORDER: *William D. Barton,* University of Tennessee

The chairman opened the meeting by suggesting that the topic "Cultivation of Publics" might be discussed within the following framework:

a. Define the publics we can, and should serve (definition).
b. Identify the needs of our publics (discovery).
c. Determine the methods by which we may serve (determination).
d. Communicate with our publics (dissemination)

It was pointed out by the chairman that various statistical surveys, providing a composite description of each community, are usually available as aids to the identification of publics. After identifying those to be served, and discovering their needs, there are many programming alternatives available ranging from one-hour luncheon meetings to fully developed programs. Formal and informal methods of cultivating publics, he suggested, might well include co-sponsorship of programs, and the involvement of university staff in community activities.

According to Lawrence C. Barden, the situation at Drexel Institute of Technology is somewhat unique for the following reasons:

a. Having been in operation for some seventy-four years, the evening program at Drexel is well established
b. The program specializes in engineering and business courses
c. Drexel operates a cooperative program with some three hundred companies in twenty-seven states
d. Drexel produces the type of engineer that is in demand by these companies. Thus, Drexel serves its publics by meeting their needs, and the companies take all the engineers provided.
e. With reference to cultivation of publics, the companies send students to the college. Drexel is also recruiting in the high schools.

In distinct contrast to the situation at Drexel Institute of Technology, the Thomas More Institute offers a wholly liberal arts program, and holds as its purpose the development of student curiosity on a broad spectrum. The discussion course approach is used with students reading in liberal arts areas for a broad understanding to add to, and expand the education received in high school. Cultivation of publics, stated President R. Eric O'Connor, S.J., is accomplished through newspaper advertisements and the enjoyment of a fine public image.

Stemming from the discussion were the suggestions, generally accepted by the group, that a more systematic approach to the discovery of needs, and a more effective means of defining publics, should be developed.

BUSINESS COMMUNITY RELATIONS

CHAIRMAN: *Albert E. Everett*, Northeastern University
RESOURCE: *Kenneth B. Settle*, University of Cincinnati
William T. Utley, University of Omaha
RECORDER: *Roy Ilowit*, C. W. Post College

This meeting was devoted to an exploration of the problems encountered by the evening college in its relations with the business community.

Albert E. Everett called attention to the increasing tendency of business and industry to assume responsibility for the continuing education of their employees, to establish their own schools and to conduct their own courses. It was suggested by one participant that this might be a good procedure if the job were well done.

As discussion continued on this point, William T. Utley intimated that perhaps the evening colleges were not working diligently enough to define the needs of the business community.

Some of the issues that were raised, although of significant interest, were not solely the problems of evening colleges. As stated by Kenneth B. Settle, the problems discussed were not unique to the evening college, but were also problems with ramifications which applied to the entire university; the resources of the evening colleges do have limitations.

The chairman brought the meeting to a close with the acknowledgment that although there were few pat answers to the many questions and problems raised, this type of discussion had its distinct values.

COMMUNICATIONS MEDIA

STUDENT PUBLICATIONS

CHAIRMAN: *Thomas J. Dolphin* Clark University
RESOURCE: *Daniel R. Lang* Northwestern University
O. W. Snarr Bradley University
RECORDER: *H. Rodman Jones* University of Tulsa

The types of student publications considered in this session included yearbooks, student handbooks, literary magazines, selected student papers, and newspapers. Except for the last item, the discussion may be quickly summarized. It appeared to be common practice for the evening college to have a page or pages in an all-college yearbook rather than publishing a separate yearbook of its own. Some institutions publish a student handbook which includes items such as a calendar of activities, information about student organizations, activities available for evening students, parking regulations, and the like. The publication of literary magazines, and selected student papers was not common, but was mentioned as a worthwhile type of student publication. The last item, newspapers, consumed most of the discussion time.

The following types of papers were identified:

a. *The student run "free" press which has no administrative control is financed by subscriptions sales plus advertising.*
b. *The student run paper which is financed by compulsory student fees and advertising, and is supervised by a board of publications.*
c. *The house organ which is a joint operation of students and administrators (probably the most common type in evening colleges).*
d. *A "pure" house organ published by the administration (not a true "student" publication).*

During the course of the discussion the following pertinent questions were raised:

a. *Does the full time day faculty attempt to censor the evening college paper? The group did not feel that this was a common problem with the paper, but might be in the case of a literary magazine.*
b. *Are faculty advisers and student editors paid? While practices varied, the participants appeared to recommend that the academic load of the adviser be reduced, and that the students receive some pay.*
c. *Should day students be permitted to serve on the evening newspaper? In some instances evening students desire to do the work themselves.*

while in others a day student takes over the task because he has the time.

d. What should be the function of a school paper? The group agreed that the evening college newspaper should deal primarily with college news since the city papers would serve to cover the national and international news. Editorials, however, might well be concerned with national as well as college news.

The following suggestions, relative to the publication of the evening college newspaper, were offered:

a. To get the greatest value from the experience of publishing a paper, the student shouldsdo as much of the writing and editing as possible.

b. The board of publication or administration should be alert to the fact that some students wish to use the paper to engage the administration in arguments about college operations. This problem may be anticipated and controlled somewhat by a skillful board and tactful adviser. The board should be composed of a balanced group representing the students, faculty, and administration. These should be cooperative people who communicate easily and can develop clear policy statements.

c. Prospective editors may be asked to state their proposed editorial policies and defend them before the board.

d. In some instances it might be best to get coverage in the day paper. A regular column or page at specified intervals might provide sufficient coverage for evening college news. Such cooperation between day and evening students was mentioned in a variety of situations.

e. The possibility of students misinterpreting or printing inaccurate information about college matters can be reduced by a clear policy statement that requires such stories to be cleared through specified channels.

f. The administration should not demand that students print news concerning administrative decisions. Such material may be presented through other channels, which has the advantage of administrative control over its presentation.

UNIVERSITY PUBLICATIONS

CHAIRMAN: *Virgil W. Alexander,* Northern Illinois University
RESOURCE: *Paul R. Betz,* St. Joseph's College
George F. Knerr, Pace College
RECORDER: *Donald J. Herrmann,* College of William and Mary

The discussion in this section pointed up the lack of research or even of objective data in this entire area. Institutions have developed procedures for printing and distributing bulletins and brochures largely on a trial and error basis. Most deans and directors have little idea of the actual effectiveness of the procedures used.

It was generally agreed that the most effective medium for publicizing the evening college program was the paid advertisement in local newspapers. Some public institutions are not allowed to use this technique due to state laws or budgetary regulations.

It appears that the catalogue is the primary publication of evening colleges although many institutions utilize a brochure for saturation publicity and limit distribution of the more complete catalogues to students who actually enroll. Some institutions sell catalogues in the bookstore and others limit free copies to one per student by punching the student's identification card when the catalogue is distributed. A majority of the institutions represented at the meeting, however, made few restrictions on distribution of catalogues, many utilizing this medium as the primary source of publicity.

It appeared that most institutions depended primarily upon mailing lists for distribution of catalogues and brochures. A few institutions placed bulletins in stores, business offices, waiting rooms, and the like to be picked up by prospective students.

Most of those in attendance seemed to agree that the evening college catalogue should be sufficiently complete and comprehensive to stand alone and not require duplicate distribution of a general catalogue to each evening student. There was much less agreement concerning the desirability of listing an instructor for each course included in the announcement.

The problems of in-term communication between the evening college office and the faculty and students were discussed briefly. There appeared to be a general lack of confidence in the effectiveness of newsletters and handbooks although many institutions use them. Mr. Betz proposed that maintaining an open door and a friendly attitude in the office was the most effective technique. Most of those in attendance seemed to agree.

RADIO-TELEVISION

CHAIRMAN: *Donald B. Setterbo*, University of Toledo
RESOURCE: *M. Robert Allen*, University of Miami
Martin J. O'Hara, Thomas More Institute
RECORDER: *Edward D. Shanken*, Engineers Joint Council

The discussion in this session was greatly facilitated by the opening remarks of the chairman who touched upon the historical background of educational radio-television, outlined some barriers to its optimum use, and presented some factors which favor the optimum use of educational television.

It was pointed out by Donald B. Setterbo that, historically, the utilization of radio and television by educational institutions has been weak. Educational radio lost over two hundred potential AM stations during the period 1921-1936. The Federal Communications Commission came to the aid of education again in 1952 by reserving, over the objections of commercial interests, 242 channels for educational television. The reasoning behind this action by the Federal Communications Commission included, among other considerations, the necessity for the programming of significant social-political developments not necessarily compatible with commercial television.

According to Donald Setterbo, barriers to the optimum utilization of mass educational radio and television reside in the following major categories:

a. *Traditional attitudes of the instructional staff fear of usurpation of individual prerogatives, fear of displacement individual inflexibility, and the requirement for re-education to fully utilize educational television techniques.*

b. *Administrative reluctance to utilize educational television as reflected in traditional inflexibility, erroneous cost estimates as contrasted with actual student unit costs, unwillingness to challenge public and instructional fears, and apathy toward innovation.*

The following factors, as outlined by the chairman, favor optimum utilization of educational television:

a. *Funds for its development are available through foundation and government sources.*

b. *The availability of literature empirically validating the effectiveness of educational television.*

c. *Inherent in education's acceptance of responsibility for mass media development is a commitment to objectivity.*

d. *Education's acceptance of a commitment to innovation and experimentation (not necessarily being met) for optimum utilization of communication media.*

M. Robert Allen expressed the view that evening colleges have rarely been the innovators in educational television, and have also failed to provide leadership for the effective utilization of educational television, and other new media. New educational television equipment is on the market, he said, and the trend toward self-learning and tutoring has been developing, however, there is still a need for basic research in educational television.

Commenting on some reactions to educational television, Martin J. O Hara stated that instructors felt that television "gobbled up" material, and the problem of no feedback from the viewers left something to be desired.

The question of what makes television educational was examined with conflicting viewpoints resulting. One viewpoint held that television is not educational unless there is continuity, and a consistent theme. In reply, another participant declared that a single lecture could be educational, and continuity was unnecessary.

Edward D. Shanken briefly described the Graduate Engineering Education System (GENESYS) established at the University of Florida. He explained that this closed circuit television system with five terminals in various locations in Florida successfully employs a "talk-back" feature. Students may break in with questions at any time during a lecture.

It was suggested that new approaches to the presentation of material over television must be developed and utilized, the picture of a man lecturing from behind a desk is not enough. The medium must, however, capitalize on the talents of the instructor, and avoid gadgetry as an end in itself. The student must have confidence in the method in order for it to be effective.

Edward Shanken described the continuing education program of the Engineers Joint Council, and its experimentation with newer media systems for meeting specific problems. The group offered its encouragement to the Council in this effort.

NEWSPAPER

CHAIRMAN: *Richard Bray* The American University
RESOURCE: *Howard A. Ward* University of Detroit
Glen L. Bushey University of Chattanooga
RECORDER: *Leonard S. Stein* St. Louis University

The evening college newspaper, and the public press were the chief subjects discussed at this meeting.

Richard Bray expressed the view that the function of the evening college newspaper is to interpret, for the part-time student, the philosophy of the university and the evening college. Specifically, he urged that the evening college newspaper emphasize the point that there is nothing inherently wrong with part-time education. He also urged high-quality publications based upon professional standards.

Howard A. Ward saw a slightly different function for the evening college newspaper. It was his opinion that the function should be that of tying together the full-time and part-time student bodies. Although acknowledging the difficulties of producing a professional-type job, he would have students publish the newspaper.

Glen L. Bushey was in sympathy with both points of view, but suggested that perhaps an expansion of the regular college newspaper would fulfill the related requirements.

The entire group participated in a discussion of ways and means for obtaining good coverage in the public press. Among the expressed ideas and suggestions were the following:

a. *The evening college should have its own public relations specialist, or have one member of the university public relations staff assigned to the evening college.*
b. *The evening college administration should cultivate good personal relations with the press. Inviting local newspapermen to audit courses without charge has proven quite effective in establishing good press relationships for several colleges.*
c. *Radio and television interviews, particularly when members of the faculty are involved, are excellent means for reaching the publics who are likely to enroll in the evening college.*

B. PROBLEM CLINICS

BUSINESS CURRICULUM ACCREDITATION

CHAIRMAN: *Thomas J. Bryde* Iona College
RESOURCE: *George E. Grauel* John Carroll University
Robert F. Berner State University of New York at Buffalo
RECORDER: *Rev John E. O'Brien* Seton Hall University

The chairman gave a brief summary of the revised standards proposed by the American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business to improve the calibre of business offerings in off campus centers and evening schools. In line with its new objectives the A.A.C.S.B. recommends a uniform program for an entire institution, this uniform program to be the same for day and evening. At the same time A.A.C.S.B. appeared to indicate that the degree awarded the part time student should be different from that awarded his counterpart in the day program. The other major demand is to upgrade the evening faculty by seeking more full time members with higher terminal degrees. The A.A.C.S.B manifests some realism in allowing a transitional period during which the new objectives might be realized.

The discussion led by the resource members centered around four main points

1. *Would the uniform approach reduce the evening college to a weak replica of the day program?*

Many expressed a real fear that the uniform curriculum for the whole institution might seriously limit the independence of the evening college. The evening college serves an older and more mature group whose membership is comprised of people actively engaged in practical business pursuits during the daytime hours. In most evening programs the curriculum has been tailored to their specific needs and goals. To impose the exact curriculum that prevails in the day school would be unrealistic. The uniform program demanded by the A.A.C.S.B. would, therefore, in the opinion of many, threaten the separate approach of the evening business school. Its unique contribution in serving the needs of adults would be substantially curtailed.

2. *Is the main target of the A.A.C.S.B. the evening faculty?*

Many of the participants were of the opinion that the primary objective of the revised standards is to ensure a different type of faculty, one that would be essentially the same as that of the day faculty. The goal appears to be a staff which would be at least seventy-five per cent full-time, with a substantial upgrading of degrees. There were those who felt that this objective was unrealistic since it rests upon the unproven premise that the full-time teacher is necessarily superior to the part-time teacher. Then too, others questioned which degrees the new standards favored. Is the Ph.D or the MBA looked upon as being more valuable? Many came to the defense of the part-time teacher who possessed no higher degree than a wealth of specialized experience which appealed to the mature evening student.

3. *Should the evening college think in terms of a degree different from that offered by the day school?*

Some felt it unfair for the A.A.C.S.B. to demand the same program but a different degree for the evening student. One suggested approach was that, in view of the trend toward curtailing or even discontinuing undergraduate business degrees, it might be well for the evening college to offer the A.A. degree in business. Several participants invited attention to the fact that a number of states require that candidates for the C.P.A. examination complete certain specified business courses in order to be admitted to the examination. If the trend toward the discontinuance of business degree programs in the day school continues, where can a prospective candidate for the C.P.A. degree obtain the necessary courses except in the evening college?

4. *What should be the attitude of evening colleges relative to the new standards established by A.A.C.S.B.?*

In view of the transition taking place in business schools, and the discontinuance of undergraduate programs in business at such established institutions as Rutgers and Tulane, the majority of participants were of the opinion that it would be advisable to "watch and wait."

EDUCATION CURRICULUM ACCREDITATION

CHAIRMAN: *Lynn W. Eley,* Washington University
RESOURCE: *Grover Angel,* George Washington University
Arthur L. Assum, University of Rochester
RECORDER: *Ralph A. Hyde,* University of Tennessee

The group departed from the prepared list of problems for discussion in order to study and discuss Dr. W. Earl Armstrong's "Proposals for Improving Field Services in Teacher Education." It was pointed out that Dr. Armstrong, former director of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), has since retired and his views do not necessarily represent those of the association. The article was written at the request of the Committee on Accreditation in Teacher Education for publication in the AUEC Newsletter. The group approved a suggestion that a cover article be printed along with Dr. Armstrong's paper in which it would be pointed out that Dr. Armstrong's views do not necessarily represent those of AUEC.

Each of the following statements by Dr. Armstrong was examined:

(a) *All courses for credit should be taught by day faculty.*

(b) *Credit courses should be taught only on campus.*

(c) *Part-time credit should be limited to three semester hours per year.*

(d) *Course content in evening programs is not of the same quality as in day courses.*

(e) *Teacher education should not be job related.*

(f) *Teachers should be given time off to attend day classes because they are too tired in the evening.*

Much of the discussion centered around the thought that NCATE poses much the same threat to evening programs in teacher education as the American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business does to business education. The fact that many institutions can no longer offer evening engineering courses was brought out in support of this threat. Each of the above assumptions was discussed, but time did not permit a thorough examination of Dr. Armstrong's paper.

The following statements, relative to accreditation of teacher education, received the general approval of the group:

(a) *The preparation of an adult student for teaching differs from that of the young undergraduate.*

(b) *Attempts must be made to combat the prejudice against evening programs and overcome professional jealousies of the day faculty.*

(c) *Curtailment of part-time evening programs in teacher education will deprive a vast audience of the opportunity to seek additional knowledge. These part-time students will find it extremely difficult to take a leave of absence in order to attend day classes.*

(d) *If our evening programs are quality programs let us present the facts and show why it is so. There are, for example, numerous studies which show the performance of evening students to be above that of the day students. At least one institution represented at the meeting, George Washington University, has records which show that evening students achieve higher scores on the Graduate Record Examination than day students. The same was found to* *be true on comprehensive examinations.*

(e) *There are strong indications that accrediting associations are misinformed as to our concern for quality.*

(f) *A prevailing thought was that the best professional education is job related as opposed to the ivory tower approach.*

Some conclusions drawn from the discussion are that: (1) Caution must be exercised against over-reacting to NCATE and the article by Armstrong; (2) High priority should be given to the development of a philosophy of the role of part-time study in professional education. It was then suggested that the chairman of each committee in AUEC be appointed to a special committee for the purpose of preparing a position paper setting forth the AUEC aims, objectives, and philosophy on professional education. The suggestion was presented to Robert F. Berner, President of AUEC.

STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES

CHAIRMAN: *Mary T. Egginton,* Adelphi University
RESOURCE: *Sherman V. N. Kent,* Rider College
Kingsley M. Wientge, Washington University
RECORDER: *William F. Kelly,* University of Louisville

Kingsley M. Wientge reported that a committee on cybernation had been established at Washington University to study those aspects of evening student personnel services which might be faciliated by the use of a computer. The committee saw the possibility that personnel data such as test scores, grade-point standing, classes required for graduation, substitutions already taken, and anticipated letters of progress from the dean, might be considered mechanical processes that could be carried on by a computer.

The counselor, preparing to meet with a student, would have already called on the mechanical brain to supply him with a large amount of significant data about his counselee.

When the computer was not busy with such functions it would be handling registration, grading papers, and storing and analyzing valuable data for the entire university.

There was general agreement with Sherman V.N. Kent's statement that we're going to have computers whether we like it or not. "Let's be sure that we control them rather than having them control us. We must be the masters." In his opinion we should emphasize the personal development and the seeking of wisdom from within for our evening students and that this approach to personal development demands a student personnel service of an individual nature. He also indicated that more personnel services should be provided for evening students since their instructors, many on a part-time basis, are paid less than their day colleagues. This available money, saved through the difference in salaries, should be made available for evening school services to students. He was also concerned with whether the student personnel services offered in most schools are in any way equal to what their day-college counterparts receive, pointing out that if we have inferior programs we deserve them if we continue to allow them.

At Rider College one out of each thirty dollars collected is set aside to support dances, coffees, and a student newspaper which comes out four times a year. Arch W. Hunt stated that the only fee collected from adult students at Baylor University was a Health Service charge of $7.50. Most of the participants felt that this was a high fee to collect from evening students. Dr. Hunt pointed out that evening students receive the same health care as those in the day. Incidentally, he added, evening students are entitled to stay in the dormitories on a first come, first served basis.

At this point the group returned to a discussion on the computer and its relationship to the development of good study habits through programmed instruction. It was felt that programmed instruction could help build confidence in the students in terms of learning ability. Group discussion was also singled out as a valuable tool in developing this confidence and a sense of identity with the university. Another tool mentioned was the use of testing as a learning device as opposed to its punitive use in over-emphasizing grades. It was generally agreed that a school undertaking the use of a costly computer in student personnel work would presume a large student body of perhaps 5,000 and a well thought out program for its use rather than its misuse.

In summary, it was agreed that machinery could take over the mechanical work of evaluating, registration, scoring of tests, and similar tasks, thereby saving time for group and individual counseling.

ADMISSION AND RETENTION

CHAIRMAN: *Peter Meyer,* Queens College, New York
RESOURCE: *Rev. Richard T. Deters, S.J.,* Xavier University
Brother Francis Emery, F.S.C., LaSalle College
RECORDER: *Richard D. Robbins,* The Johns Hopkins University

The discussion was opened by Chairman Peter Meyer with several comments concerning the nature of admission and retention policies. The question of admission and retention, he stated, covers the entire spectrum of education. One cannot discuss admission standards without also discussing the standards which are to be applied toward the education for which one is admitting. This statement is also true for the subject of retention. Admission and retention standards reflect general, social, and educational philosophy and must be considered as an integral part of that philosophy. Evening colleges should be responsible for educating as many people as are found to be educable. Classroom space, facilities, and faculty should not be allowed to become defeating problems despite ever-increasing enrollments. Evening colleges should open the doors wider and should convince the university and the community alike that the college experience must be extended to all who can profit from it.

Father Richard T. Deters in expressing his views on admission and retention policies, said that the evening college should not thrive on dismissals from day divisions. Reference to admission policies applies to credit and degree programs. There are certain levels in the hierarchy of education which are our particular concerns. By admitting or retaining a specific student, is there injury to other students? By admitting or retaining a specific student, is there an adverse effect on the professor in the manner in which he should, or desires to, conduct his class? Finances must be considered in determining these policies, but they should not be the overriding consideration. Rights of individual students must be considered, but the consideration of these rights must not override the consideration of the total student body and the total faculty. This should be a guiding principle in evening college admission.

In describing some of the admission and retention policies, Brother Francis Emery stated that LaSalle College uses standard examinations as admission devices. These examinations are also used for placement in some specific areas. Special non credit review courses are given in mathematics and English composition. Structured admission and retention policies must be enforced in any program if it is to operate effectively. These policies are for the protection of the student as well as the institution. It has been found that if a student remains at La Salle College for three semesters he will probably continue in the program. Large group guidance classes are offered in several areas. The total problem of student mobility is being studied at LaSalle College.

Entrance and retention requirements should be based on the philosophy of education which guides general administrative policy. Institutional differences will result in different requirements and in varying implementation of requirements for admission to, and retention in, degree programs. There should be a distinction made as to whether the program is basically one for adults or one for adolescents.

The function of the counselling office covers counselling on admission and retention policies, and its work is supple mented by remedial programs or courses offered in order to bring the students up to the necessary standards so that they may benefit from the college experience.

A substantial part of the meeting was devoted to the discussion of questions, related to admission and retention policies, posed by the participants. A special effort was made to provide specific assistance to some of the newer members of A.U.E.C.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEVELOPMENT OF PERSONNEL

CHAIRMAN: *Robert E. Sharer* Michigan State University
RESOURCE: *J. G. Brown*, The George Washington University
Thomas A. Emmet University of Detroit
RECORDER: *David H. Mangnall*, Newark College of Engineering

The chairman indicated at the outset that this problem might have been more appropriately labeled, "In-service Education for Evening College Administrative Staff," and posed three basic questions

1. *How can the chief administrator of an evening college administer a development program for his staff when only five to seven per cent of the Association of University Evening College membership have been specifically prepared for their current positions in higher education for adults?*
2. *What do we hope to have our staff members become? Do we want robot administrators or do we want educators?*
3. *Is the task of staff development the concern of the dean, or should the department of adult education assume this responsibility?*

The resource members of the group suggested that the in-service program include the following:

1. *A complete orientation of new staff members to include frank and open discussion of the college philosophy and policy on educational objectives.*
2. *The utilization of staff committees to discuss specific projects in detail.*
3. *Distribution of professional literature among all members of the staff.*
4. *The encouragement of staff members to take advantage of opportunities to further their educational preparation.*
5. *A request to A.U.E.C., and other national organizations to provide assistance by establishing guide-*

lines for in-service training, and to develop scholarships for those desiring to enter the field of adult education.

While there was general agreement among the participants on the need for, and the importance of in-service training of staff, it was also recognized that problems centering around time and money would have to be resolved.

Alternate suggestions relative to procedures for in-service training included inter-institutional visitations within the A.U.E.C. membership; exchange of job descriptions, and utilization of regional and national surveys on organization and training; arrangements for staff members to attend local, regional and national conferences related to higher education for adults; the assignment of staff members to responsible, challenging administrative tasks; and provisions for teaching assignments in the field of specialization.

Although cognizant of the fact that a staff member, profiting from an in-service program, might be lost to another educational institution or to a governmental agency, the group considered this a healthy situation, and one which should not in any way lessen the effort to provide for effective in-service education.

PART IV
ASSOCIATION BUSINESS

Friedrich, Richard L., Assistant to the President, Bellarmine College

Grauel, George E., Director, Institutional Planning, John Carroll University

Hardwick, C.T., Dean, Continuing Education, University of Detroit

Kelly, William F., Assistant Dean, University College, University of Louisville

Kitchin, William W., Coordinator, Christopher Newport College of the College of William and Mary

McMahon, Ernest, Dean, University Extention Division, Rutgers, The State University

Matre, Richard A., Dean, Graduate School, Loyola University (Chicago)

Saums, Edmund R., Assistant Dean, Cleveland College, Western Reserve University

Larson, Karl J., Director, Special Programs, Northeastern University

CONTRIBUTING (PERSONAL CLASS)

Bowen, Stewart Lloyd, Director, Evening Division, Regis College

Cole, David W., Dean of the College, High Point College

Connor, John D., Director, Evening Division, Massachusetts Bay Community College

Gould, Marvin, Assistant Professor, Engineering Extension, Iowa State University

Jaros, Andrew G., Director, Admissions and Financial Aids, Oklahoma City University

Mapp, John A., Director, Evening Division, Richmond Professional Institute

Pindell, Watson F., Director, Evening Division, Baltimore Junior College

Poliacik, Stephen, Director, Field Services for Higher Education State Department of Education in New Jersey

Popham, Lewis C., III, Director, Evening Extension Division, Orange County Community College of the State University of New York

ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY EVENING COLLEGES

ANNUAL MEETING - OCTOBER 24-28, 1965

SHERATON-DALLAS HOTEL,
DALLAS, TEXAS

OPENING BUSINESS SESSION - OCTOBER 25, 1965

CALL TO ORDER

President Kendall opened the general session of the AUEC Twenty-Seventh annual convention at 9:30 A.M. Following the invocation by N. Lee Dunham, Baylor University, Dr. Keith Baker Vice-President of Southern Methodist University, welcomed the delegates.

MINUTES

The minutes of October 26 and 29, 1964 which were published in the 1964 annual *Proceedings* were given formal approval.

MEMBERSHIP

At the request of the President, the Executive Secretary announced the following new members admitted to AUEC since November 1964.

INSTITUTIONAL

Louisiana State University in New Orleans, New Orleans, Louisiana, Alban F. Varnado, Director of Evening Division (March 1965)

Manhattan College, Bronx, New York, Joseph Ladota, Director of Evening Division (March, 1965)

Bryant College, Providence, Rhode Island, Ralph C. Dean, Director of Continuing Education (October, 1965)

St. Bonaventure University, St. Bonaventure, New York, Leo E. Keenan, Jr., Director of Evening, Summer and Extension (October, 1965)

ASSOCIATE

Carroll, Frank T., Jr., Dean, College of Engineering Technology, Delgado University

Charters, Alexander N., Vice President, Continuing Education, Syracuse University

Dobbins, Cecil L., Assistant Dean, Evening College, University of Akron

CONSTITUTION CHANGES

The following proposed amendments had been distributed to the membership through the Newsletter more than two weeks in advance of the annual meeting as required by the Constitution.

Art. IV, Section 4, delete: "for the unexpired term"; add: "Should the offices of the Executive Secretary and the Editor of the Newsletter come vacant at the same time, the Executive Committee shall solve this problem in the manner it deems best."

Art. V, Section 2, delete: "The immediate past president of the Association shall be the chairman of this committee."

Art. III, Section 2, No. 5 to be revised as follows: "Applications for membership shall be accompanied by a letter of recommendation from an institutional member and by the application fee. The Executive Committee shall establish an application fee to defray expenses involved in processing applications. This fee is non-refundable."

Art. V, Current Section 4 to become Section 5 and Section 4 to read: "A committee on membership shall be appointed by the President. The Membership Committee shall make recommendations on institutional applications to the Executive Committee. The Executive Secretary shall serve as chairman of the Membership Committee and shall appoint members of visitation teams."

The proposed amendments were voted on by the membership and ordered adopted.

REPORT OF CSLEA

Dr. A.A. Liveright, Director of the CSLEA, reported on their activities. He noted that the Center has been active in the following items;

1. *Future of the evening college (report has been published)*
2. *Federal legislation*
3. *Secretariat to the International Congress*
4. *Arranging tours for foreign adult educators*
5. *Consultant activities*

Dr. Liveright said the Center has engaged in a number of new activities. These include.

1. *Community organization and urban education*
2. *Special degree activities*
3. *Art education*
4. *Counseling of adults*
5. *Negro colleges*

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Father Richard T. Deters, Chairman of the Committee, gave the report. He expressed his appreciation for the cooperation he had received from the Executive Committee and the membership. A copy of the report appears as a supplement.

Schaefer, George A., Director, Evening, Summer and Extension, New Haven College

Saunders, Gerald H., Assistant Director, Evening Division, Massachusetts Bay Community College

PROXIES FOR VOTING MEMBERS

The Executive Secretary reminded the convention delegates that, according to Article VI, Section 2 of the AUEC Constitution, "on matters of business calling for official action by the Association, each member institution shall have one vote, which shall be cast by the dean or director of the evening college or his designated representative." The Executive Secretary had several letters authorizing designated persons to serve as proxies. Additional letters were solicited from those who could not be present, in person, at the next business session on Wednesday.

REPORT OF THE TREASURER

The Treasurer reported total cash receipts of $14,358.56 for 1964-65 and disbursements of $11,931.43. The current commercial bank balance is $6,776.27. There is a net balance of $3,065.87 which is to be carried into the reserve account and a balance of $539.40 in the University of Oklahoma account. The savings bank account amounts to $9,848.70 making total cash resources of $17,424.43. This is in harmony with the long-established tradition of the Association to maintain reserves approximately equal to the level of expenditures for a single fiscal year. (It should be noted that the above figures represent only an 11 month year due to the change of the fiscal reporting year.) This report was received. A detailed summary of the financial report is included as a part of the supplement of these minutes.

CONVENTION INVITATIONS

The Executive Secretary notified the membership that six offers of convention sites for 1968 are in his files.

San Francisco, California
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Washington-Baltimore
New York City, New York
Chicago, Illinois
Des Moines, Iowa

Although many other letters and solicitations have been received from local chambers of commerce, convention bureaus, and hotels, the Association did not recognize them unless they were accompanied by a letter of invitation from an AUEC member institution. Other members desiring to serve as hosts for 1968 and subsequent years were requested to file letters prior to the second business meeting on Wednesday.

EVENING BUSINESS PROGRAMS

The Chairman of the Committee, Dean Robert Berner moved acceptance of the written report. The report was received and a copy appears as a supplement.

EVENING STUDENT RELATIONS

Dr. Peter Meyer, Chairman of the Committee distributed his report. He thanked members of the Committee for the excellent work that they had done. The report was received by the membership and appears in the supplement to the minutes.

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

The Legislative Committee report was presented to the membership by the Chairman, Dr. Martha Farmer. She noted that the Higher Education Act had been approved and thanked her committee and the membership of AUEC for the splendid cooperation and assistance. A copy of this report appears as a supplement.

PUBLIC RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Dr Edwin Spengler Chairman of the Public Relations Committee distributed a report of the Committee. He expressed thanks and appreciation to the Committee for their fine report The report was received by the membership and appears as a supplement to the minutes.

REGIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. David Mangnall, Chairman of the Regions distributed his report. The report was accepted by the membership and appears as a supplement.

RESEARCH COMMITTEE

In the absence of the chairman, the report of the Research Committee was presented by Dean Abercrombie. He announced that the Salary Survey Report has been mailed to the membership. A copy of the Committee s report appears as a supplement.

RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

Dean Hyman Lichtenstein requested that anyone having resolutions to present should give them to a member of the Committee.

SPECIAL PROGRAMS FOR WOMEN

Mrs. Helen Crockett presented the report of her Committee. A copy of this report appears as a supplement.

JOINT COMMITTEE

The report of the Joint Committee was presented by Dr. Howell W. McGee. A copy of the report appears as a supplement.

WORLD STUDY TOUR

Father Edward Pappert reported on the world study tour. For the purpose of the minutes, the following summary is enclosed.

REPORT ON STUDY TOUR

JUNE 1965

Father Pappert (University of Windsor) gave a report on the Study Tour to Europe in June 1965, jointly sponsored by AUEC - NUEA - CADESS.

First he outlined the topics of discussion of a North American - U.K. Conference held at Oxford University. This took the direction of exchange programs, the rise of the "certification" movement in England, and the work of the W.E.A. (Workers' Educational Association).

Then he remarked on the First World Conference on Adult Education held in Denmark under the sponsorship of the I.C.U.A.E., and touched upon the development of Adult Education throughout the world, ranging from illiteracy problems in most underdeveloped countries to the most sophisticated use of teaching machines in the U.S. At this conference, the delegates attempted to put together legitimate goals of university adult education, stressing such items as teacher preparation, counseling, publishing, in-service education for the professions, and the adaptation of university courses to the general public.

Next, he dealt with Adult Education in Yugoslavia, tracing the development of the movement from the post-war period to the present, showing that Yugoslavia has taken Adult Education quite seriously, and has insisted that all educational agencies become involved. To this end, the government has stabilized its educational reform and has shown special interest in the preparation of adult educators. Father Pappert also commented on the work of the Trade Union Federations and the Workers' University in accomplishing the ideals of Yugoslavia.

The final portion of Father Pappert's talk dealt with the sessions held in Paris at the headquarters of UNESCO where the group was addressed by the people in charge of the adult educational sections. These included the World Literacy Program to which the universities could contribute by special training programs for specialists. The problems of youth were also discussed, stressing the psychological problems of out-of-school youth and the role that UNESCO could play as a research unit in this field. UNESCO itself, he said, was greatly interested in the whole concept of Adult Education, and felt that a great deal more could be done to promote the image of continuing education throughout the world. It was suggested that all educational agencies become involved in Adult Education programs, and an attempt be made to integrate all of these, even if it meant the creation of an Institute parallel to, but quite apart from similar university activities.

(Rev.) E. C. Pappert, C.S.B.
University of Windsor

PUBLICITY

The Executive Secretary read an item appearing about evening college programs in the magazine *American Youth*. The article lists AUEC as a prime source of information. The Executive Secretary also read a letter from Clyne Maxon, Inc., asking about the possibility of using AUEC as an information point for persons interested in evening work. This announcement will be carried on the televised GE College Bowl.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 A.M.

Respectfully submitted

Howell W. McGee
Executive Secretary

ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY EVENING COLLEGES

ANNUAL MEETING - OCTOBER 24-28, 1965

SHERATON-DALLAS HOTEL
DALLAS, TEXAS

CLOSING BUSINESS SESSION - OCTOBER 27, 1965

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 A.M. by President Ralph Kendall.

SUPPLEMENTARY MEMBERSHIP

The Executive Secretary announced that one additional Associate Member had been admitted to AUEC since the opening session October 25.

Cooper, Edward F., Director, University College
Baltimore Division, University of Maryland

AD HOC COMMITTEE ON TEACHER EDUCATION

Dean Grover Angel, Chairman, distributed the report of the Committee. He thanked members of the Committee for their work. A copy of the report appears as a supplement to the minutes.

BUDGET

Director James Southouse, Chairman of the Finance Committee, presented a recommended budget for 1965-66. The membership voted to accept the budget as recommended. A detailed report appears in the supplement section.

PROPOSED CONVENTION SITES

A show of hands on the proposed sites for 1968 indicating preference was taken. A tally of the preferences follows:

San Francisco	60
New York City	18
Philadelphia	8
Washington-Baltimore	8
Chicago	4
Des Moines	2

This information will be used for the guidance of the Executive Committee.

Dean Hyman Lichtenstein, Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions, requested approval for the following resolutions;

1. *Be it Resolved, that the AUEC as a body and the attending members as individuals voice their joyous Thanks to the host institutions for the 1965 annual convention -- Baylor University, Southern Methodist University and Texas Christian University.*

Our special thanks and gratitude are due to John M. Claunch, chairman, N. Lee Dunham, Mrs. Sarah Ciuffardi, Mrs. Mary Miller, and Thomas C. Palmer of the Local Arrangements Committee for their gracious and efficient efforts on our behalf and for their judicious choices of accommodations and activities for us and our wives.

We ask Dean Claunch to convey our sincere appreciation to all the silent members who worked with and for the Local Arrangements Committee.

We thank all the above for helping to prove that Southern hospitality in general and Texas Hospitality in special, is not a myth but a living reality.

2. *Be it Resolved, that the Association offer a heartfelt "Thank you" to President Ralph C. Kendall, his executive committee, his committee members, and all his other appointees for a year of imaginative leadership, difficult and devoted work beyond the call of conscience or duty, and demonstrably outstanding achievement.*

3. *Be it Resolved, that the Association expresses a special note of appreciation to Robert C. Osborne, chairman, and the other members of the Program Committee for the excellent planning and implementation of this twenty-seventh annual convention program.*

We also extend thanks to all speakers, chairmen, resource persons, recorders, and all other participants whose contributions added to the success of the program.

The resolutions were unanimously adopted.

NOMINATING COMMITTEE

The President called upon Father Richard Deters, Chairman of the Nominating Committee, to present his report. The slate of nominees is as follows:

Vice-President	Ernest McMahon
Directors-at-large	Donald Peets, Clifford Winters
Editor of Newsletter	Gurth Abercrombie
Executive Secretary - Treasurer (one year term)	Howell W. McGee

There being no further nominations from the floor it was moved and seconded that the entire slate be approved as presented. The motion was carried unanimously.

CONCLUDING REMARKS BY PRESIDENT KENDALL

In his concluding remarks President Kendall recognized the services of the Executive Committee and noted in particular the services rendered by retiring members of the Committee, Father Edward Pappert, Dr. James Baker, Father Richard Deters.

ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

1. The membership voted that the following resolution be sent by wire to the Commissioner of Education:

Be it resolved, that the Association of University Evening Colleges in its annual meeting expresses an earnest conviction that Title I, Community Service and Continuing Education Programs, of the Higher Education Act of 1965 would best be administered under the Division of Higher Education in the Office of Education and that the Secretary convey this conviction to Commissioner Keppel by telegram.

2. The membership voted to instruct the Executive Committee to review and implement the recommendations and suggestions given in the talk by Ray Witte.

COMMENDATION TO PRESIDENT KENDALL

The delegates with a standing ovation commended President Kendall for his service to the Association. There being no further business President Kendall declared the business meeting adjourned at 10:30 A.M.

Respectfully submitted

Howell W. McGee
Executive Secretary

SUPPLEMENT I

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

1964-65

CASH BALANCES AT SEPTEMBER 30, 1965:

Bank Account (Regular Account)	$ 6,776.27	
Membership Application Revolving Account	260.06	
University of Oklahoma Account	539.40	
Savings Account (Norman Building and Loan)	9,848.70	
TOTAL CASH ACCOUNTS AT SEPTEMBER 30, 1965		$17,424.43

INCOME FOR 1964-65:	BUDGET	ACTUAL
Dues:		
Membership:		
Institutions	$11,625.00	$10,995.00
Associate	1,425.00	1,201.35
Contributing:	200.00	
Association		50.00
Personal		185.00
Miscellaneous Revenue:	300.00	
Who's Who Sales		313.00
Proceedings Sales		140.00
Newsletter Subscriptions		45.00
Balance of 1964 AUEC Convention		1,005.27
Research Conference (Income of $180.00 less Expenses of $178.54)		1.46
TOTAL INCOME FROM REGULAR OPERATIONS	$13,550.00	$13,936.08
Savings Account Interest	350.00	374.38
Increase in Membership Application Revolving Fund (Excess of Collections over Expenses)		48.10
TOTAL INCOME FOR 1965-65	$13,900.00	$14,358.56

FINANCIAL STATEMENT
(Continued)

EXPENSES FOR 1964-65:	BUDGET	ACTUAL
Publications		
Proceedings	$ 900.00	$ 900.00
Newsletter	2,600.00	2,600.00
Printing, Roster, Enc.	500.00	507.70
Office Expense	100.00	158.72
Postage	300.00	277.73
Travel	1,500.00	1,501.05
Secretarial Expense	4,000.00	3,150.76
Leadership Conference	1,000.00	840.83
Committee Expenditures	900.00	374.48
Convention Expenses (Executive)	100.00	96.35
Research Committee	200.00	-
Annual Dues to Affiliated National Organization	300.00	300.00
Operating Cost of Joint AUEC NUEA Committee on "Uniform Reporting"	500.00	222.17
Honorarium, Executive Secretary	1,000.00	1,000.00
Loss on Currency Exchange Rate	-	1.64
TOTAL EXPENSES FOR 1964-65	$13,900.00	$11,931.43

Note: In addition to the above $1,500.00 was transferred to the savings account.

ACCOUNTS RECEIVABLE:	
Institutional	$ 75.00
Associate	210.00
Who's Who	16.00
Proceedings	19.00
TOTAL ACCOUNTS RECEIVABLE AS OF SEPT 30, 1965	320.00

Note: The books are kept on the cash basis so that no income is reported until the cash is actually collected. For information, the accounts receivable balance on October 21, 1964 was $285.00.

SUPPLEMENT II

REPORT OF THE TEACHER EDUCATION THROUGH EVENING PROGRAMS COMMITTEE

At a regular meeting of this Committee it was decided that perhaps our greatest contribution during 1964-65 could be made to the A.U.E.C. membership at large by opening channels of communication with the specialized accrediting body in this field. Consequently, the Chairman and Vice Chairman of this Committee held a meeting with Dr. W. Earl Armstrong, who was approaching retirement as the Director of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, and discussed some of the problems confronting evening school deans and directors in setting up programs for teachers. We requested Dr. Armstrong, and he agreed, to prepare an article which we would submit for publication in the *Association of University Evening Colleges Newsletter* and the *National University Extension Association Spectator*. Due to the fact that the article was completed too late for submission for publication prior to the national A.U.E.C. meeting, it has been duplicated and is herewith presented to the A.U.E.C. membership.

Respectfully Submitted:

Virgil Alexander, Northern Illionis University
Arthur L. Assum, University of Rochester
Henry D. Carpenter, Jr., Virginia State College - Norfolk
Edward Cooper, University of Maryland
Freda Goldman, Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults
Richard A. Mumma, The Johns Hopkins University
Martin J. O'Hara, Thomas More Institute
Richard Bray, Vice Chairman, The American University
Grover L. Angel, Chairman, George Washington University.

PROPOSALS FOR IMPROVING FIELD SERVICES IN TEACHER EDUCATION*

The directors of field services in teacher education have been working for several years to improve the field services offered to teachers in service. They have recognized that the quality of these services has not always been as high as it should be. Some institutions have been more careful than others in safeguarding that quality. These directors, however, are not in the most favorable position to enforce high standards for two major reasons. First of all, they are not in their local institutions able to resist the pressures that come from the schools and the college faculties to provide services and to offer them for credit regardless of effectiveness. Second, they do not have control of an accrediting procedure that can be used to enforce higher standards in field services in teacher education. They, therefore, have to rely on persuasion and on such agencies as the regional accrediting associations and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. It is true that the National Association of Directors of Field Services in Teacher Education have developed some goals and standards for such field services and without doubt these are proving useful to staffs of institutions in evaluating their programs. But the fact remains that they are practically powerless to enforce them. The effectiveness of the regional accrediting agencies and NCATE in this aspect of teacher education may be less than in most other aspects for some time.

---

* W. Earl Armstrong, Distinguished Lecturer, Florida State University, Tallahassee; Formerly, Director of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.

It seems timely, therefore, to give some thought to the quality of the field services offered by colleges and universities in teacher education. The academic climate in general seems favorable to a reappraisal of any and all aspects of teacher education and such men as Conant and Koerner have been especially critical of what is being done in the name of teacher education for persons who are fully employed. The purpose of the statement which follows, then, is to add another dimension to the thinking necessary to develop a workable program for our times.

CONDITIONS THAT HAVE CREATED PROBLEMS

There is no question about it; the colleges and universities are under pressure to provide services to teachers and to some degree to school systems. There is some question about why they are under this pressure. Is it because school officials are not meeting the professional needs of teachers to keep abreast of the times? Is it because teachers are so thirsty for new skills, knowledge, and understandings? Or is it primarily because of more or less artificial incentives to which teachers are responding? The evidence seems to indicate that policy changes by school boards, changes in full-time study requirements by colleges and universities, and changes in certification requirements have had much to do with the great demand for field services in teacher education. The influences of these and other factors need to be understood before considering ways to improve the situation.

School systems vary greatly in the quality of the programs offered for teachers in service. In some but not many the assistant superintendents, supervisors, and principals establish study groups by school levels, by buildings, or by subject fields and draw on local talent or employ persons from colleges and universities to provide leadership. The focus in such cases is usually on local problems with practical solutions to problems getting first call over educational theory. Rarely is any credit given for these study groups. And herein lies one problem. Unless participation in these study groups is required of the teachers concerned many are likely to pass them by and instead take field service courses offered for credit. The number of school systems that provide opportunities for teachers to keep abreast of the times and to extend their understandings, however, is relatively small. It may be stated with confidence, therefore, that the demand for field services for employed teachers has been caused to some degree by the vacuum created by leaders in school systems.

Without doubt most teachers are eager to become increasingly well prepared to teach at the highest possible level of effectiveness. There is evidence that most of them will go to some pains to do this. But it can not be argued with much conviction that the large numbers of teachers who are taking courses while fully employed do so because of their great thirst for knowledge. For example, a liberal arts college in the South with an enrollment of about 1500 reports that at present 840 teachers are working on Master's degrees with at least part credit for drive-in and extension courses. This situation can be multiplied hundreds of times over across the country. There just must be forces other than the thirst for knowledge that are driving these numbers to take work while fully employed. What are they and who is responsible for them?

School board policies may be the source of some of the motivation. More than one policy has moved teachers to take courses during the school year; some in rather subtle ways. For example, when teachers became scarce about 1942 school boards began again to employ married women. Many of these women had children of their own in school. During the summer when these women teachers might have been attending college their children were not in school and their services were needed at home. Furthermore, their husbands often got their vacations during those months when the children were not in school. If mother could take the necessary courses during the school year all could be free to take vacation together. Hence the pressure from married women to make courses available during the regular school term.

School board policies tying course credits and salaries together have unquestionably created demands for courses and obviously the more of these that could be taken during the regular year the fewer summer sessions teachers would have to attend. By taking courses and going to summer school the teacher could move up rapidly on the salary scale. Some boards have provided salary increments for each six hours of credit or even fewer, while others have provided increments on the basis of advanced degrees only. Both of these policies have caused teachers to press for courses to be offered within commuting distance at convenient locations. The policy of paying added salary increments for taking a certain number of hours of college credit regardless of whether it counts toward a degree however creates greater demands for courses than does the policy of basing increments on advanced degrees or at least on courses leading to degrees.

The policies of school boards have, therefore, clearly caused teachers to request colleges and universities to offer courses for credit that can be taken by fully employed teachers. The offering of such courses by colleges and universities have tended to reduce the in-service programs provided by the school systems themselves. In fact, these courses within commuting distance have become the in-service programs on which school boards rely for the improvement of their teachers. But changes in the college and university situation have certainly affected the demand for these courses. These changes have two dimensions.

Fifty years ago there were at most twenty-five institutions that offered respectable graduate work for teachers. Now the number attempting some work at the graduate level is larger than 200 and at least 100 are offering work at the Doctor's degree level for teachers or administrators. The increase in the number of institutions offering graduate work for teachers has obviously brought a graduate program within easy commuting distance of most school systems. It seems reasonable to conclude that this proximity has stimulated the demand for extension and drive-in courses. The second dimension in the collegiate situation has been the change in full-time study requirements for advanced degrees, especially Master's degrees, and in the definition of residence credit. In some colleges and universities a teacher may be granted a Master's degree without enrolling for any full-time study, even for one summer session. Some will allow a maximum of twelve semester hours of credit during a regular school year, not counting the summer session, for fully employed teachers. That is nearly one-half of a full load of graduate work for persons who presumably are working at full-time jobs. Such policies and practices cause thoughtful persons to raise questions about the quality of the work being done by teachers in these courses, to say nothing of the ethics involved in this form of moonlighting on the time and energy being paid for by school boards. And to add to the temptation to take the whole graduate program while full employed, some institutions have greatly liberalized their definition of residence credit. Evening classes held on campus or at any location off campus that can be regarded as a center for graduate study are awarded residence credit. It is clear, therefore, that the institutions have either stimulated the demand for field service courses by liberalizing residence requirements or they have responded to the demands resulting from other causes.

Unquestionably the requirements for the renewal of teaching certificates established by state departments of education have also stimulated the demand for field service courses. Since the depth of the depression, state after state has increased the amount of college credit required for the standard teaching certificate, especially at the elementary school level. They moved from two, to three, to four years of college preparation until now forty-four of the fifty states require at least a Bachelor's degree for the regular teaching certificate. This escalation was brought about largely by establishing requirements for the renewal of the less-than-standard certificates. Such certificates were generally valid for three to five years and could be renewed on evidence of the completion of six to twelve hours of work which would be applicable to the next higher certificate. As a result of this stimulus thousands and tens of thousands of teachers were looking for courses that could be taken for credit during the regular academic year. Since practically all states now require the Bachelor's degree as a minimum, the same stimulating effect is achieved by paying teachers more through state aid formulae if they hold Master's degrees. So long, therefore, as certification requirements are being raised or state aid is tied to certificates held by teachers, the state certification requirements will influence the demand for field service courses.

All of these forces - school board policies, college and university expansion in numbers and their adoption of more lenient residence requirements, and the use of certification requirements as a means of increasing the amount of teacher preparation - have served to create a demand by teachers for courses that can be taken while they are fully employed. Other factors relating to the economic position of the teacher in our society and such sociological forces as urbanization, as scarcity of teachers and a more tolerant attitude toward what the teacher does outside working hours have also operated in subtle ways to increase the demand for field service courses for teachers. Furthermore, teachers have seen such courses used widely by such fields as engineering and business.

Clearly the demand has developed and the colleges and universities, all kinds of them, have responded. More often than not the response has been piecemeal; a request has come and a decision has been made to provide the service requested. Seldom have institutions developed policies against which to evaluate requests. And even less frequently have they developed a program of their own without waiting for pressures from the field to provide service courses for teachers. As a result serious problems have arisen which unless solved satisfactorily threaten the quality and the scope of these services. Institutions have, for example, made inadequate financial provisions for such services. Often the program must be self-supporting even to the degree that every course must pay for itself. This policy limits field services almost entirely to credit courses to the exclusion of non-credit short conferences, services to such interest groups as reading, science and school administration, and consultant arrangements with school systems. It also encourages teachers who really need a course to persuade their colleagues who do not need it to take it in order to have a number large enough for a course to pay its way. Institutions have often also made inadequate arrangements for administering the program. Generally the staff is too small to do the research necessary to diagnose the needs in the field and to mobilize the collegiate faculty to deal with them. In the absence of such resources, the Director generally responds to demands as they arise by offering the courses that his budget will support. Sometimes the collegiate faculty stimulate these demands because they wish to have the money that the extra-pay-for-extra-work policy will bring. The materials of instruction to undergird these courses are often limited to what the professor can carry with him in his brief case. Sometimes when the Director finds regular faculty members too busy to offer field service courses he employs the best he can find among practitioners in the field. Such people are already fully employed and are doing this on an extra-pay basis. Such problems exist in all institutions to varying degrees, but even if the institutions could find reasonable solutions to them the complex of problems relating to field service programs would not be solved. The institutions, the school systems (school boards), and the state departments of education will need to take concerted action in terms of some guiding principles before reasonable order can be restored in this field. Some proposed guidelines and specific actions are presented for consideration. Doubtless some will think they go too far and others that they do not go far enough. In considering them, it should be clear that the proposals do not apply to adult education in general or to part-time study in such fields as business and engineering. The focus is on field service programs for teachers.

ASSUMPTIONS AND GUIDELINES FOR PROGRAMS

ASSUMPTIONS

The proposals which follow are based on certain assumptions relating to the teaching profession and to learning. The major ones are:

1. Teaching as a profession demands the full time and energy of its members.

Some will say that this assumption ignores the great variations in the energy output of persons. They will say that some who give all of their time and energy to teaching will accomplish less than others who give two thirds of their time and energy to the profession. And they will be right. But when a teacher begins to think in terms of quantitative accomplishments his status as a professional person becomes questionable. The fact that his colleague who has poor health must spend most of his evenings relaxing does not justify his taking a heavy load of college courses for credit just because he can do as much as his colleague and carry that load, too.

2. *The in-service education of teachers is a joint responsibility of collegiate institutions, local school systems, and state departments of education.*

The surge for academic degrees and salary increases based on advanced preparation have resulted in an abdication by many local school districts and state departments of education in favor of colleges and universities. With practically all states now requiring a minimum of a Bachelor's degree for all beginning teachers, it is to be expected that the push for college credit for each and every activity will ease up. When this happens schools and state departments of education should take some of the burden off the collegiate institutions for the in-service education of teachers.

3. *There should be a level of preparation beyond which a teacher should not be forced to go.*

For the present, that level might reasonably be set at five years of preparation. School boards could appropriately expect teachers beyond that level to participate in institutes, workshops, and other informal activities sponsored by the school system but course work for credit as a requirement would stop at five years.

4. *Teachers are likely to learn most effectively when they can give full time to study for an extended period of time.*

When the full-time teacher takes course work he must shuttle back and forth between study and teaching. It takes time and energy to make the shift each time. He loses the advantage of continuity in thinking and, furthermore, much time is lost in locating and organizing the materials of instruction he will use in his study. Some will argue that any such loss is more than compensated for by the immediate use in his teaching that can be made of the ideas gained in his course work. Unfortunately, or not, few courses bear that directly on the day to day work of the teacher. Learning appears to be like a gasoline engine in this respect: you may expect better mileage out of longer trips.

5. *Adequate materials of instruction and conditions favorable to their use are essential to higher quality learning.*

Few courses appropriate for teachers draw on materials limited to one book. It is a rare book that presents more than one viewpoint with reference to an issue. Teachers even more than others need exposure to more than one point of view with reference to most matters. Libraries, laboratories, and all kinds of teaching aids are, therefore, very important in courses for teachers. Also of importance are conditions favorable to their use. Conditions are not favorable when teachers drive in to any center in late afternoons, evenings, or even in summer sessions if they drive away as soon as the class is finished. The teacher who is trying to learn needs not only to have access to a wide array of materials but also needs to have them handy. And time needs to be set aside for their use before or after the class.

PROPOSED GUIDELINES

The assumptions that have been presented have served as the major basis for some proposals for bringing order into field service programs. The proposals call for changes in the usual efforts in this direction made by school systems, state departments of education, and collegiate institutions.

1. School systems should have in their budgets a substantial item for in-service teacher education. At best, collegiate institutions can prepare persons to begin to teach. They cannot make mature professional persons. Whether teachers continue to grow or stultify depends more upon the in-service programs of schools than on the collegiate institutions. If new money cannot be found, many school systems could use funds for this purpose that could be had by eliminating some of the supervisors in the central office. Some of the money should be used to support in-service programs in the schools during the academic year, some for local workshops in summer, and some for sending teachers to summer schools in collegiate institutions.

2. The major emphasis in school system in-service programs should be on efforts by faculties in individual school buildings to improve their services. As needs emerge from these building-centered efforts for teachers in such areas as science, mathematics, music, art and the like to come together on a system-wide basis, provision should be made for that kind of activity. The teachers, administrators, and supervisors in the schools should be drawn upon to provide leadership but the collegiate institutions should be the major resource. In fact, it would be advantageous for schools to have contracts with universities for such help. The major functions of collegiate faculties in the in-service programs are to help teachers visualize an educational program better even than the present best practice and to assist them in developing a rationale in terms of learning theory for what they are doing. Local school leadership should provide the major help needed to improve present practice.

3. School boards should abandon the practice of granting salary increments when a teacher accumulates a certain number of college credits. Instead they should have salary scales for Bachelor's, Master's, Six Year Specialist's and Doctor's degrees with the clear understanding that teachers at the Bachelor's level are to secure their Master's degrees through work in summer sessions or leaves of absence within a five year period. Those holding Master's degrees or higher should be expected to participate in a satisfactory manner in building and system-wide studies during the academic year and in school sponsored workshops in summers periodically. School systems should assume responsibility

for these in-service programs; should use the field service resources of collegiate institutions when needed; and should expect no college credit for such activities. In all respects these programs should be the responsibility of the school systems, not the institutions.

4. Requirements for certification and renewal of certificates should be changed drastically. States are trying to solve too many teacher personnel problems through certification. What grade level or subject field a teacher may be permitted to teach should be determined by such instruments as state aid and school accreditation rather than by certification. A general certificate to teach might well be granted when an approved four-year program has been completed and a higher certificate granted within a given time when a five year program has been completed; nothing in between. The higher certificate could be made contingent upon the completion of a planned fifth year program in an accredited institution. The program would be for teachers, not for counselors, administrators, or supervisors.

5. School systems, state departments of education, and collegiate institutions should join in limiting to one three-hour course the amount of work a fully employed teacher would be permitted to take during regular academic year. And the total amount of such credit that could be counted on the requirements for a Master's degree should be limited to six hours of credit. The remainder of the work for the Master's degree should be done when the teacher can give full time to study.

6. All courses for credit should be taught by the regular faculty of the institution concerned. School people, laymen, and government employees may have important contributions to make but they should not be made responsible for an activity that is tangential to their major concerns.

7. Credit courses should be taught only on campus or in centers where adequate materials are available at times when students may use them. Regardless of the location, students should be expected to spend a substantial block of time studying the materials either before or after each class period.

8. Field service programs for teachers should be supported by contracts with school systems, by regular college or university funds, and by fees from teachers who are taking courses for credit. The contracts with schools should cover a part of consultant services, surveys, and special materials of instruction. School systems should pay for most of such services. Institutions should expect no greater proportion of the cost of field service courses for teachers to be paid by students than is paid by the regular student body for the courses which they take. The policy often followed of requiring field services to be self-supporting has resulted in classes filled with students many of whom are taking the courses largely because they are all that are available.

These are some of the guidelines that appear to point to higher quality in field service programs. They may not all meet with enthusiastic approval. Some teachers will object because they would be inconvenienced. Some college and university officials will object because money is hard to find and such rigorous requirements might cut down on enrollment. School systems may object on the grounds that this is the work of the institutions. And state departments may say that so many credits every five years is the only way to stimulate teachers to study. But it is obvious that the present plan is not working. A new look seems called for. Quality seems more likely to come from courses when students are devoting their full time to study and when conditions are favorable to the use of a wide array of materials. Quality is necessary at whatever cost.

SUPPLEMENT III

REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE TO STUDY THE QUALITY OF BUSINESS PROGRAMS OFFERED THROUGH EVENING COLLEGES

During a brief meeting of the Committee in St. Louis, it was decided to call a meeting of the Committee in January, 1965, at which we would invite Dr. William K. Selden, Executive Director of the National Commission on Accrediting. Dr. Selden did meet with us at the new Continuing Education Center of the University of Maryland on Thursday, January 14, 1965

At the meeting we reviewed each of the revised standards adopted overwhelmingly by the A.A.C.S.B. in May of 1964.[1] While endorsing the basic A.A.C.S.B. objective of improving the quality of evening college and extension programs in business, we expressed a belief that this purpose could not proceed from any assumption that part-time faculty and part-time students were *per se* sub-standard. Dr. Selden, sympathetic, in part, to our concerns, asked that the Committee prepare a "Statement of Concerns"[2] which would be made available to the Board of Commissioners of the National Commission on Accrediting when they reviewed the A.A.C.S.B. report. This "Statement" was cooperatively written by the members of our A.U.E.C. Committee.

On April 3, 1965, the National Commission on Accrediting adopted the following resolutions:

(1) *The Commission endorses in principle the efforts of A.A.C.S.B. to encourage higher standards of*

---

[1] A Summary of the Revision is available (in limited quantity) to those requesting it.

[2] The Statement of Concerns is available (in limited quantity) to those requesting it.

education for business, but expresses reservation about the effectiveness of some of the means planned by A.A.C.S.B. to bring about the improvements;

(2) *the Commission accepts the implementation of the Association's amended (May 1, 1964) membership standards on an interim basis with the understandings: (a) that the standards will be applied and interpreted liberally; (b) that the Association will appoint a committee to review the standards and the statements of concern which have been expressed about them and to submit proposals for possible improvements in them based on the experience of their initial implementation; and (c) that the Association will request the Commission to provide consultation to this committee;*

(3) *the Commission expresses its willingness to provide consultation to the Association for this review; and*

(4) *the Executive Director of the Commission is instructed to report his observations regarding this review to the Commission at its next annual meeting.*

It is our hope that the A.A.C.S.B. Committee which is to review the standards and "Statement of Concerns" will permit sufficient flexibility in action to prevent an adverse influence on evening and extension courses.

SUPPLEMENT IV

REPORT OF THE LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

AIMS OF THE COMMITTEE

The Legislative Committee has endeavored to keep the membership informed of current and pending Federal legislation as it affects the evening college and its students. Articles of interest to the members have been submitted to the A.U.E.C. Newsletter so that all could be informed of current issues that relate directly to the legislation involved in the Higher Education Act of 1965. The aim of the Committee was to make the members aware of the issues involved in the current legislation and the need to make the voice of the Association known to the appropriate legislative committees of the Congress of the United States.

TITLE I, HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

Milton R. Stern, Assistant Dean, Division of General

Education and Extension Services of New York University, convened a meeting with members of the New York State Office of Education, on Wednesday, May 12th at the Barbizon Plaza Hotel in New York to discuss the implications of Title I of the proposed Higher Education Act of 1965 with those individuals who represented colleges which are members of the N.U.E.A. and/or the A.U.E.C.

As a result of this ad hoc meeting on May 12th a second meeting was arranged on June 17th with Dr. Allen Kuusisto, Assistant Commissioner for Higher Education, New York Department of Education in the State Education Department Building Annex in Albany. The report of Dean Milton Stern of this meeting is included in an addenda to this report. Of particular significance is the State authority to administer grants under Title I. Though the report in no way provides a final answer - since it is recognized that each state has the right to establish its own system of administration what is proposed for New York State may be of interest and serve as a guideline to those deans who are in states with similar state departments of education.

MEETINGS OF THE LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

The Legislative Committee met at Fairleigh Dickinson University for a luncheon meeting on Wednesday, June 2, 1965. At this meeting general problems related to current legislation were discussed. The request by Senator Wayne Morse, Chairman of the Education Subcommittee of the United States Senate that a statement of the Association of University Evening Colleges be included in the Congressional hearings was considered at some length. A statement was drawn up and submitted to President Ralph Kendall for his approval. This statement was submitted by him not only to Senator Wayne Morse but also to Representative Adam Clayton Powell, Chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, for inclusion in the Congressional hearings.

STUDENT DEFEREMENTS UNDER SELECTIVE SERVICE

Father Richard Deters, on September 1st, raised a question as to whether the Legislative Committee should review the rules which Selective Service has established for the deferment of part-time students. In his letter to Dean Kendall, he indicated that, in his opinion, part-time students were not given sufficient consideration for deferment while many full-time students who were actually not of the academic caliber of many part-time students, were almost automatically deferred. To this Dr. Sol Jacobson responded that the local draft boards have discretionary powers which enable them to defer students regardless of classification if they feel the individual situation merits such action and is in the national interest. He wrote:

> " .., *local boards have full discretionary power now, under the statute, to grant a 2S classification to part-time students if in the opinion of the local*

board the registrant's activities as a student are in the national interest. For example, if the student works during the day to support himself and to be able to pay for his education in the evening on a part-time basis, the board is not precluded from classifying the registrant in 2S if it deems such classification appropriate.

To be sure, local boards now classify full-time matriculated students in 2S if they are taking at least 12 semester-credit hours. However, even with such full-time students, the local board retains discretionary powers. Since a student classification may be regarded as an occupational deferment, if the local board is of the opinion that the claimed full-time study is merely a device to obtain deferment and not truly an "occupation," it may classify the registrant in 1A.

It is also interesting to note that if the registrant has dependents and his being drafted would result in hardship to such dependents, the local board may grant a 3A classification. Many part-time students have been so classified, the part-time study being another element for the local board's consideration."

Dean Russell F.W. Smith, Division of General Education, Extension Services, New York University, extended an invitation for the Legislative Committee, both the incumbent and incoming, to meet at New York University on Friday, October 1st, as his luncheon guests. At this meeting, the following action was considered:

A. SELECTIVE SERVICE

Father Richard Deters again addressed a communication to Professor Sol Jacobson, in which he asked that the deferment of part-time students be critically reviewed by the Legislative Committee. After due deliberation the Committee declined to act on this problem. It was the view of the Committee that the local Selective Service boards are faced with varying quotas and supplies of manpower. Consequently, non-uniformity of treatment in individual cases is inevitable in the Selective Service System. A hard and fast rule of deferment cannot be instituted by the Federal government. The present directives to the Selective Service Boards provide a maximum of protection for the part-time student.

B. DEFINITION OF HALF-TIME STUDENT

In relation to the Higher Education Acts of 1964 and 1965, the consensus of the Committee was that a definite statement by the Association of University Evening Colleges concerning the definition of a part-time student is necessary. To this end the following resolution is submitted to the membership for its approval:

> *Be it resolved that all bureaus and divisions of the U.S. Office of Education and other governmental agencies be instructed to abide by the definition of half-time student as it appears in the various bills dealing with higher education, i.e., "a student who is carrying at least one-half of the normal full-time work load as determined by the institution."*

C. Professor Sol Jacobson has submitted the following resolution "to the Executive Committee and, if approved by it, for a membership vote."

WHEREAS TITLE IV *of the proposed Higher Education Act of 1965 (S. 600 and H.R. 3220) establishes scholarships for students of low-income families; and*

WHEREAS *these scholarships are limited to full-time students who have not attained the age of 21; and*

WHEREAS *many students enrolled in evening college come from low-income families or are low-income wage earners, but are over the age of 21 and pursue courses of study on a half-time basis; and*

WHEREAS *the proposed Higher Education Act of 1965 thus discriminates unjustly against such evening college students;*

NOW, *therefore, be it*

RESOLVED *that Title IV of the proposed Higher Education Act of 1965 be amended to provide scholarships for students over the age of 21 who come from low-income families or earn low incomes, as defined by the Commissioner, and who are carrying at least one-half of the normal full-time workload as determined by the institution; and be it further*

RESOLVED *that copies of this resolution be mailed to the members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the House Committee on Education and Labor, to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the Commissioner of Education, United States Office of Education.*

D. SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Several sources of information as to current legislation before the Congress of the United States is available to evening administrators. The College Clearing House publishes a loose leaf service to inform subscribers of current legislation under consideration affecting higher education. The American Council on Education's Newsletter frequently summarizes pending legislation. If an institution is a member of the American Council on Education, it is possible for the evening deans and directors to obtain a copy of its bulletin for $5 per year. Use of these two sources would lead to 1) prompt information; 2) increased ability of the evening deans to communicate with legislators; and 3) obviate the need that the Legislative Committee circulate information individually to the membership.

It is suggested to the membership that they write to Mr. C. Sumner Stone, Jr., Special Assistant to the Chairman, House Committee on Education and Labor, and ask that the 300 page summary of all legislation under consideration be sent to them at the earliest possible moment. This will bring the evening deans up to date as to future legislation so that they may be able to communicate with the appropriate representatives in the United States Congress.

E. LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATION

It is the view of the Legislative Committee that the present ad hoc representation of the Association of University Evening Colleges in Washington, and in various state capitols is singularly inadequate. It is recommended that the A.U.E.C. institute a permanent paid secretary in Washington, D.C., which would not only be concerned with current legislative matters, but would also be involved in the follow-up and implementation of the legislation passed by the Congress of the United States.

F. PUBLICATIONS

Matthew Clancy, President of the International Association of Evening Student Councils, who attended the meeting in ex-officio capacity brought to the attention of its members several publications which covered current legislation affecting higher education and answers to questions that might arise from this area of interest to evening administrators. They were *School Management*, current issue dealing with Federal legislation in relation to education. The address may be obtained from your library's index of periodicals. The second was *P/I for Schools*, published by Mayer Pabest Group, Inc., 22 West Putnam Avenue, Greenwich, Connecticut 06830. The title of this article was "Spotlight on Federal Aid to Education," June-July, 1965.

Respectfully submitted for the Committee,

Martha L. Farmer, Chairman
Sol Jacobson, Vice-Chairman

1964-1965

Thomas J. Bryde, Iona
Mary T. Egginton, Adelphi
Martha L. Farmer, CCNY, Chairman
Sol Jacobson, Brooklyn, Vice Chairman

B. C. Lambert, Fairleigh Dickinson
David H. Mangnall, N.C.E.
Russell F.W. Smith, N.Y.U.

1965-1966

Grover Angel, George Washington
Richard Clemo, Adelphi
Martha L. Farmer, CCNY, Chairman
Sol Jacobson, Brooklyn, Vice Chairman
George Knerr, Pace
B. C. Lambert, Fairleigh Dickinson
H. Lichtenstein, Hofstra
Milton Stern, N.Y.U.
Richard Tobin, Queens, CUNY

SUPPLEMENT V

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON MINIMUM DATA AND DEFINITIONS

The Joint AUEC NUEA Committee on Minimum Data and Definitions was established in 1960 by the boards of the respective organizations for the following purposes:

1. To develop common definitions in higher adult education,
2. To determine a specific reporting period.
3. To establish minimum enrollment information which should be collected and reported by the AUEC and NUEA
4. To work with other national organizations and government agencies in reporting a comprehensive image of higher adult education enrollments and exploring the possiblity of recording higher adult education enrollments by the university registrar.

During the 1964-65 period the Joint Committee activities included the following:

1. Collection and publication of its fourth annual report on programs and enrollments of member institutions, according to the statement on definitions and minimum data adopted by the boards of both associations. This year for the first time publication of this summary report was accomplished under the editorship of Dr. Howell McGee who was able to reduce printing costs by at least 50 per cent.
2. Publication of a three year summary report on program and enrollment data, complete with graphs and charts, an analysis of the summary, and projections of enrollments in higher

adult education to the year 2000. Funds for the financing of this project were appropriated by the two associations.

3 - Continuing maintenance of close liaison with those governmental offices in Washington concerned with higher adult education statistics and reporting. On request, we have assisted the Statistics Bureau of the Office of Education regarding certain aspects of their special questionnaire to determine a basis for the allocation of funds under the newly enacted Facilities Bill. In addition, we have continued to work with that office in their plans to mount one or more national surveys on higher adult education.

4 - The chairman of the committee has served as NUEA's official representative to the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers. Under this arrangement we have maintained close working relationships with admission officers and registrars in keeping them apprised of developments in higher adult education, and have worked with them in our mutual problems of the delineation of terms and the collection and publication of higher educational statistics. We have been asked to assist them again in the revision of their *Handbook of Data and Definitions in Higher Education*, which they expect to complete in the next year or two.

5 - In connection with the annual request to Deans and Directors for the completion of the 1964-65 questionnaire on programs and registrations, they were asked to complete an evaluation form. An opportunity was given to indicate approval of the questionnaire and annual report in its present form, as well as to offer suggestions for revisions, additions, or deletions. The Joint Committee will analyze these evaluations and determine what changes - if any - should be made in succeeding years.

Frank Neuffer
University of Cincinnati
Representing AUEC

Howell McGee
University of Oklahoma
Representing AUEC

F. Lloyd Hansen
University of Minnesota
Representing NUEA

Phillip E. Frandson, Chairman
University of California Extension
Los Angeles
Representing NUEA

SUPPLEMENT VI

REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

In March 1963, during the CSLEA Leadership Conference at the University of Chicago's Center for Continuing Education, the president of AUEC called a meeting of those associations in attendance whose primary concern was the higher education of adults. As representatives of AUEC the president delegated Dr. Sol Jacobson as chairman and Dr. Thomas Emmet. Also represented at the meeting were NUEA, CADESS (Canadian Association of Directors of Extension and Summer Sessions), and CSLEA. This was the first formal meeting on record of representatives from such associations with the avowed intent of working out means of closer cooperation.

Subsequently various committees in both AUEC and NUEA wrestled with this problem, the history of these efforts is contained in the *Proccedings* of both associations and in the *AUEC Newsletter* and the *NUEA Spectator*. Of particular importance is the discussion between AUEC and NUEA of an actual merger.

Since such a merger appeared unlikely to be approved by the AUEC membership in the 1964 annual meeting, the chairman of the Advisory Committee, prior to the meeting, proposed to the other members of the Advisory Committee an alternative, namely, some kind of council of all the associations, not merely AUEC and NUEA, which had a major stake in higher adult education. Dr. Charters of Syracuse, a member of the Advisory Committee, picked up this suggestion and invited a group to meet at the University of Syracuse as part of a conference on that university's library of adult education.

Meanwhile the annual convention of AUEC was held in St. Louis late in October 1964. During the convention it was clear that AUEC could take one of three courses of action, or all three but in some sequence: 1) actual merger of only two associations, AUEC and NUEA, 2) the formation of a new association to include all those with a major stake in higher adult education; or 3) a closer form of continuing cooperation of all such associations, the specific form to be determined by the associations themselves, perhaps through a council of presidents, a committee within the American Council on Education, or such like. Immediate merger with NUEA and the formation of a new association were looked upon unfavorably by a majority of the membership, but the door was still open to other forms of cooperation.

In its annual report the Advisory Committee recommended that AUEC continue to explore cooperation with all other associations of higher adult education.

Dr. Mumma's Committee on Relationships with Other Associations recommended to the Executive Committee that AUEC explore the feasibility of a council of presidents or some such arrangement of all those associations which had a major stake in higher adult education. The Executive Committee took action immediately by recommending that AUEC send representatives to the Syracuse meeting.

At this meeting, November 20-22, 1964, the associations and their representatives were:

Adult Education Association
Mr. Arthur Crabtree (Past President)
Dr. John B. Holden (President)
Dr. Eugene Johnson (Executive Director)

American Library Association
Eleanor Phinney (Ex. Sec. of the Adult Services Div.)

Association for Field Services in Teacher Education
Dr. James Manwaring (member)

Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges
Dr. Robert L. Bruce (Ext. Com. on Organization and Policy)
Dr. Stanley J. Drazek (Div. of General Extension)

Association of University Evening Colleges
Rev. Richard T. Deters, S.J. (Chairman, Advisory Committee)
Dr. Ralph C. Kendall (President)
Dr. Howell W. McGee (Secretary-Treasurer)

Canadian Association for Adult Education
Dr. Alan Thomas (Director)

Canadian Association of Directors of Extension and Summer Sessions
Rev. Gerard Forcier (President)

Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults
Dr. A.A. Liveright (Director)

Department of Agriculture
Dr. Joseph L. Matthews (Dir. of the Div. of Extension Research and Training)

International Congress of University Adult Education
Dr. A.A. Liveright (Secretary)

L'Institut Canadien d'Education des Adultes
Miss Madeline Joubert (General Secretary)

National Association for Public School Adult Education
Mr. Harrison G. Otis (Past President)

National University Extension Association
Dr. Stanley J. Drazek (President)

U N E S C O
Dr. J.R. Kidd (Chairman, International Com. for
Advancement of Adult Education)

University Council on Education for Public Responsibility
Chancellor William P. Tolley (President)

Invited also to the conference, but not represented were: American Association of Junior Colleges, Commission of the Professors of Adult Education, Council of National Organizations for Adult Education, and the United States Office of Education Division of Continuing Education and Cultural Affairs.

The delegates ranged over many problems and solutions, particularly cooperation with the Office of Education in the gathering of statistics, cooperation in research, especially in pooling funds to pay for abstracting, the publication by all the associations of a journal; a united front to influence law-makers in favor of higher adult and continuing education.

The AUEC delegates realized that the associations represented at the Syracuse meeting were not precisely those recommended by Dr. Mumma's Committee, but felt that it was wise to meet with any group interested in further cooperation. During the Syracuse meeting Dr. Drazek of NUEA graciously offered to host a second meeting at the University of Maryland. AUEC agreed to attend, but was looking beyond College Park to a meeting with associations more specifically interested in *higher* adult education.

Attending the University of Maryland meeting January 23-24, 1965, were the following associations and representatives:

Adult Education Association of U.S.A.
Arthur P. Crabtree (Past president)
John B. Holden (President)
Eugene I. Johnson (Executive Director)
Hugh G. Pyle (Visiting Staff Associate)

American Association of Junior Colleges
William G. Shannon (Ass't. Executive Director)

American Foundation for Continuing Education
William J. Trainor (President)

American Public Health Association
Cecilia Conrath (Co-chairman, APHA - HEW
Liaison Committee)

Association for Field Services in Teacher Education
Robert Poppendieck (Chairman, Research Committee)

Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges
Allan Ostar (Director, Office of Institutional Research)
R. L. Bruce (Assoc. Prof. Extension Education, Cornell)

Association of University Evening Colleges
Rev. Richard T. Deters, S.J. (Chairman, Advisory Committee)
Ralph C. Kendall (President)
Howell W. McGee (Secretary-Treasurer)
Clifford L. Winters, Jr. (Syracuse)

Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults
Kenneth Haygood (Staff Associate)

Commission of Professors of Adult Education
William S. Griffith (Member of Ex. Comm.)

Council of Graduate Schools of U.S.
Elvira T. Marquis (Staff Associate)

Federal Extension Service
Joseph L. Matthews (Director, Division of Extension Research and Training)
Raymond C. Scott (Assistant Administrator)

National Association for Public School Adult Education
Robert A. Luke (Executive Secretary)
Elmer A. Mueller (President)
Harrison G. Otis (Past President)

National Educational Radio and TV Center
Henry C. Alter (Director of Program Utilization)

National Home Study Council
William Fowler (Assistant Director)
David A. Lockmiller (Executive Director)

National University Extension Association
Alexander A. Charters (President-elect)
Stanley J. Drazek (President)
James R. Quimper (Chairman, NUEA ad hoc Comm. on the Job Corps)

Office of Economic Opportunity
Stanley Salett (Acting Chief, Education Section)

U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Phillip H. DesMarais (Deputy Assistant Secretary)

U. S. Office of Education
Edward W. Brice (Director, Adult Education Branch)
Roy B. Minnis (Specialist in Adult Education)

The delegates were favored with reports on the federal legislation which affected higher adult education, but the main business of the meeting was cooperation among the associations.

Somewhere in a report of this kind it would seem of the utmost importance to state that perhaps the chief benefit deriving from such meetings is not the resolutions which the delegates pass, but the fact that they come to know one another personally, and therefore better understood one another's problems and positions, and respect each other's views. Two friends can accomplish the impossible, two strangers often can not accomplish even the probable.

AEA made another attempt to gather support for a journal which would represent all of U.S. adult education, but the group did not come up with a solid proposal.

The delegates discussed again the very problems which led to talk of cooperation in the first instance, namely, the gathering of statistics, research, a common front on legislation, improving and maintaining standards of students, faculty, and curricula, etc.

From both the Syracuse and the College Park meetings it was obvious that all the associations represented had something in common, however, it also seemed obvious that the association of *higher* adult education were very little or not at all interested in some areas of adult education as such, and that their major problem areas were often not major areas to adult education associations. These differences in viewpoints and interests confirmed the position of the chairman of the Advisory Committee and of Dr. Mumma's Committee on Relationships when they recommended that AUEC confine its efforts at cooperation, at least initially, to other associations of *higher* adult education.

Such a meeting was held in Boston in March 1965. It was called by AUEC and chaired by the chairman of AUEC's Advisory Committee. This was reported in the AUEC Newsletter, volume xiii, no. 4, pp. 19-21.

The meeting with the American Council on Education, recommended unanimously by the Boston group, is reported by the chairman of the Advisory Committee in the AUEC Newsletter, volume xiii, no. 5, p. 25, and by ACE in the Newsletter, volume xiii, no. 6, pp. 17-19.

What does the future hold? ACE has not forgotten the Washington meeting of June 10, 1965. In the mail Wednesday (October 20, 1965) will be a letter from Dr. Dobbins of ACE calling the second meeting for November 29 of this year. The purpose of this meeting will be:

1 - to improve communications among associations in higher adult education;
2 - to identify the chief problem areas;
3 - to consider the effects of Title I of the Higher Education Act on higher adult education; and
4 - to consider development of a plan for coordination among the associations of higher adult education.

Dr. Harrington, Chairman of ACE's Commission on Academic Affairs, will act as chairman of the Committee on Higher Adult Education within his Commission. At the meeting ACE will propose this resolution (worded as accurately as I could take it longhand over the telephone): "That ACE and the organizations of higher adult education designate an individual who would accept responsibility for making a study of the organizations and of the problems in higher adult education and for assisting in the achievement of improved communications and coordination of the associations."

The mere talk about cooperation is over. Cooperation has taken a specific form, that of coordination. The future looks bright.

Richard T. Deters, S.J.
Chairman, AUEC Advisory Committee
Xavier University (Cincinnati)

SUPPLEMENT VII

REPORT OF THE FINANCE COMMITTEE
PROPOSED BUDGET FOR 1965-66

ESTIMATED INCOME:

KIND		RATE	NO.	TOTAL
I. Dues:	Institutional	@ $ 75.00	150	$ 11,250.00
	Associate	@ 15.00	100	1,500.00
	Contributing:			
	Corporate	@ 100.00		
	Association	@ 25.00	2	
	Personal	@ 10.00	15	200.00
II. Miscellaneous Revenue				250.00
III. Savings Account Interest				350.00

				$ 13,550.00

ESTIMATED EXPENDITURES:

I. Publications - Proceedings	$ 900.00
Newsletter	2,600.00
II. Printing, Roster, etc.	500.00
III. Office Expense	100.00
IV. Postage	300.00
V. Travel	1,700.00
VI. Secretarial Expense	4,000.00
VII. Leadership Conference (Mid Year Executive Committee Meeting)	1,000.00
VIII. Committee Expenditures (Authorized by President) . .	800.00
IX. Convention Expenses (Executive Committee)	100.00
X. Annual Dues to Affiliated National Organizations	300.00
XI. Operating Cost of Joint A.U.E.C./N.U.E.A. Committee "Uniform Reporting"	250.00
XII. Honorarium, Executive Secretary . . .	1,000.00

	$ 13,550.00

SUPPLEMENT VIII

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE REGIONS

Details concerning activities within the Association's 12 regional groups have been adequately covered in the six issues of the AUEC Newsletter published since the last annual meeting. Needless to say, the popularity of these grass-root sessions has increased this year, the frequency of meetings ranging from a minimum of one annually where distances between representative institutions posed problems, to several who held sessions during both the fall and spring semesters and to a few others most fortunate to be able to get together as often as once a month. It should be noted that at least two held two-day meetings (one at a resort location), that one involved a combined meeting for two neighboring regions and that joint AUEC-NUEA sessions were possible in at least two instances.

This year, at the suggestion of the Executive Committee, each region was asked to consider the common topic, "To Identify the Most Critical Issues Facing Evening Colleges in the Next Decade," using the St. Louis (October, 1964) presentations of Peter Siegle and Kenneth Haygood as resource papers. Many of the regional meetings were devoted to this subject, and, while reports of outcomes have not been analyzed and summarized to date, the publication of the results might be considered by the Executive Committee.

The Committee on Regions is ever mindful of the difficulties encountered in attempting to conduct regional activities in Region XII (Far West) since two institutions are located in the northwest area while the remainder (3) are situated in Central and Southern California. Further complications arise since more than half of these schools have a major interest in extension work. The Committee suggests that regional activity in this area be stimulated by having separate meetings for the two major locations in this region, that they be joint AUEC-NUEA meetings and that evening staff members, academic as well as administrative, at the institutions concerned be invited to participate.

The Committee referred the Executive Committee's suggestion to investigate the possibility of AUEC state organizations to the various regions. Limited responses indicate little, none or negative interest; hence it is suggested that the matter be dropped, at least pending the outcome of the findings of the President's study committee on regions and convention sites.

Other efforts of the Committee involved the compilation of membership data for the AUEC Directory (which now includes regional designations), a continuation of the practice of conducting regional sessions at the national meeting and the innovation of the President's session with the Regional Chairmen at the annual gathering.

The Committee is indebted to the Regional Chairmen for their cooperative efforts during the year and to the Editor of the AUEC Newsletter for his help in transmitting the results of regional activities to the entire membership.

Frank T. Carroll, Jr., Chairman
David H. Mangnall, Vice Chairman
Virgil W. Alexander
Fr. Gerald A. Sugrue, S.J.

SUPPLEMENT IX

REPORT OF THE RESEARCH COMMITTEE

The Committee has decided to employ the following procedure during the forthcoming year in an effort to help members find solutions to their questions about the practice of adult education:

1 - Announcement of the project through the AUEC Newsletter, and communications to Regional Chairmen.

2 - Individuals desiring to obtain information about some phase of their work will submit questions to Regional Chairmen.

3 - Regional Chairmen will forward requests to the Research Committee Chairman (Lawrence A. Allen).

4 - The Research Committee Chairman will send questions to the appropriate Resource Center. The Resource Centers, most likely located at institutions with graduate study programs or research components in adult education, will be asked to assist in this project to the extent of listing the references to the literature that deals with the questions submitted. The Library for Continuing Education, located at Syracuse University, will also be requested to cooperate in this project.

5 - When the reference list is prepared, together with suggested sources from which the literature may be obtained if not available at the inquirer's institution, a copy will be sent directly to the inquirer with a copy to the Research Committee Chairman.

6 - Evaluation of the usefulness of the project will be made by asking inquirers if the information they obtained was helpful. Each inquirer will be asked this question two to three months after his request has been answered.

Frederick M. Burgess, Villanova University
Walter H. Hayes, Jr., University of Maryland
Kingsley M. Wientge, Washington University
Karl J. Larson, Northeastern University
Roy J. Ingham, Florida State University
Assistant Chairman

SUPPLEMENT X

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON EVENING STUDENT PERSONNEL

The committee met twice during the annual convention in St. Louis in October 1964.

Since this was a newly formed committee, most of its deliberations centered around a definition of role and function. The decision was reached that the committee could best serve AUEC in an educative and consultative capacity. When called upon, individual members of the committee would visit the institution concerned and render all possible assistance to the director. If no members were able to visit an AUEC institution because of its location, inquiries would be answered by mail. In addition, it was felt that various avenues of communications should be explored so that the student personnel position could be brought before the AUEC membership. Dean Abercrombie was approached to see if various articles could be submitted to the Newsletter and with his kind cooperation, two such articles did appear during the year.

The committee has continued its close association with two related groups, (1) Commission XIII of the American College Personnel Association - "Adults in Higher Education" and (2) The Evening Student Personnel Association. This proximity has enabled the three groups to exchange ideas and plan programs dealing with evening student personnel within a larger framework than AUEC. Two programs growing out of a joint effort of the committee and Commission XIII of ACPA will be presented at the ACPA convention in Washington in April. Dean Knerr will chair a program entitled "Evaluating Adult Experience for Academic Credit" and Dr. Meyer will chair a program on "Counseling Adults in Higher Education."

The committee hopes to further its work in the coming year by considering such questions as:

1 - *What should be the standards for student personnel services in evening colleges?*

2 - *What should be the standards for training personnel workers for evening colleges?*

3 - *Is it feasible to publish a concise, general pamphlet on student personnel work which would be of use to AUEC?*

This list is by no means inclusive and is presented here merely as an example of the nature of problems which concern the committee.

Respectfully submitted

Peter Meyer
Chairman

SUPPLEMENT XI

REPORT OF THE PUBLIC RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Immediately following the Final Business Sessions at the AUEC Convention held in October, 1964, an organization and planning meeting was held by the Public Relations Committee. It was agreed that while "public relations" embraces the function of publicity, its scope is much wider and includes methods and procedures designed to create a favorable climate of cooperation and teamwork in an institution's internal and external contacts. As a first step the members of the committee decided that it would be desirable to prepare a list of recommendations for good public relations procedures. Late in the Fall, 1964, these suggestions were assembled and classified into several categories.

In the thought that the Newsletter should serve as a convenient medium through which the Public Relations Committee might reach the AUEC membership, summaries of these suggestions were prepared for publication in the "Public Relations Corner." The first of these appeared in the January-February issue (pages 8 and 9) under the caption *Public Relations Programs at the Institutional Level.* The second item appeared in the March-April issue (page 6) under the title *Public Relations Policies Tied in With AUEC Activities.*

Meanwhile, a short article entitled How Good is Your P.R. Index? prepared by the committee's chairman was circulated to the general membership of AUEC in November, 1964, in the series, "From the Dean's Desk."

In anticipation of the October Convention the members of the Committee were alerted during the summer of 1965 to the necessary steps for the preparation of news items and the arrangements for publicity in connection with the convention meetings in Dallas. These plans were completed early in October.

The Committee has also discussed the feasibility of telling the story of AUEC in national periodicals, network film, and professional journals. It is interested in receiving reports on developments in evening college operations that might lend themselves to stories and press releases for national circulation. The full membership of AUEC is invited to keep in touch with the Committee and to share with it any information and opinions about questions of importance in the field of collegiate education for adults.

Public Relations Committee 1964-1965

Kermit Johnson, Manatee Junior College
Sherman Kent, Rider College
Edward Shanken, (Formerly of Pratt Institute)
Robert Shaw, Queens College, N.C.
Edwin H. Spengler, Brooklyn College, Chairman
Raymond Witte, Loyola University

PART V
APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

ROLL OF PAST PRESIDENTS AND ANNUAL MEETINGS

YEAR	*PLACE OF MEETING*	*PRESIDENT*
1939	New York City	Vincent H. Drufner University of Cincinnati
1940	Omaho	A. Caswell Ellis (acting for Drufner, deceased) Cleveland College
1941	Cleveland	A. Caswell Ellis Cleveland College
1942	Buffalo	George Sparks (acting for A.L. Boeck, resigned) University of Georgia
1943	Chicago	George Sparks University of Georgia
1944	Pittsburgh	Norman P. Auburn University of Cincinnati
1945	Philadelphia	Lewis Froman University of Buffalo
1946	New York City	Henry C. Mills University of Rochester
1947	Minneapolis	F. W. Stamm University of Louisville
1948	New Orleans	Rollin B. Posey Northwestern University
1949	Cincinnati	Herbert C. Hunsaker Cleveland College
1950	Denver	Frank R. Neuffer University of Cincinnati
1951	Detroit	Robert A. Love City College of New York
1952	Atlanta	Cortell K. Holsapple Texas Christian University

YEAR	*PLACE OF MEETING*	*PRESIDENT*
1953	St. Louis	Henry J. Wirtenberger, S.J. University of Detroit
1954	Milwaukee	Willis H. Reals Washington University
1955	New Orleans	John P. Dyer Tulane University
1956	New York City	George A. Parkinson University of Wisconsin
1957	Montreal	William H. Conley Marquette University
1958	Louisville	Alexander Charters Syracuse University
1959	Pittsburgh	Richard A. Mumma Johns Hopkins University
1960	San Francisco	Kenneth W. Riddle Drexel Institute of Technology
1961	Cleveland	Richard A. Matre Loyola University (Chicago)
1962	Miami	Daniel R. Lang Northwestern University
1963	Boston	Richard T. Deters, S.J. Xavier University
1964	St. Louis	Earnest S. Brandenburg Drury College
1965	Dallas	Ralph C. Kendall University of Toledo

APPENDIX B

AUEC COMMITTEE STRUCTURE 1964-65

ADVISORY:

Richard T. Deters, S.J., Chairman, Xavier University
Alexander Charters, Syracuse University
John P. Dyer, Tulane University
Daniel R. Lang, Northwestern University
Richard A. Matre, Loyola University of Chicago
Richard A. Mumma, The Johns Hopkins University
Frank R. Neuffer, University of Cincinnati

AUDIT:

Robert W. Shaw, Chairman, Queens College, North Carolina
Kenneth R. Burchard, Carnegie Institute of Technology
Henry D. Carpenter, Jr., Virginia State College - Norfolk

DEAN'S DESK:

Richard A. Spencer, University of Toledo

EDITOR OF PROCEEDINGS:

Thomas J. Desmond, Utica College

EVENING BUSINESS PROGRAMS:

Robert F. Berner, Chairman
State University of New York at Buffalo
Thomas J. Bryde, Vice Chairman, Iona College
George E. Grauel, John Carroll University
William C. Huffman, University of Louisville
Allen F. Jung, University of Chicago
James R. Quimper, University of Maryland
Richard A. Spencer, University of Toledo
William T. Utley, University of Omaha

EVENING STUDENT PERSONNEL:

Martha L. Farmer, Chairman,
City College, City University of New York
Thomas A. Emmet, Vice Chairman, University of Detroit
Cecil L. Dobbins, Baldwin-Wallace College
Mary T. Egginton, Adelphi University
George F. Knerr, Pace College
Peter Meyer, Queens College
Elliott S. Palais, Pratt Institute
Richard D. Robbins, The Johns Hopkins University
Myron A. Spohrer, Washington University
Clarence H. Thompson, Drake University

FINANCE:

James W. Southouse, Chairman, University of Bridgeport
Lawrence C. Barden, Drexel Institute of Technology
John E. O'Brien, Seton Hall University

FUTURE DIRECTIONS OF THE EVENING COLLEGE:

Clifford L. Winters, Chairman, Syracuse University
Kenneth Haygood, Vice Chairman,
    Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults
Richard T. Deters, S.J., Xavier University
Francis Emery, F.S.C., LaSalle College
Daniel R. Lang, Northwestern University
A. A. Liveright,
    Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults
Richard A. Matre, Loyola University of Chicago
Ernest E. McMahon, Rutgers - The State University
James B. Whipple,
    Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults

LEGISLATIVE:

Martha L. Farmer, Chairman
    City College, City University of New York
Thomas J. Bryde, Iona College
Edward Davison,
    Hunter College of the City University of New York
Mary T. Egginton, Adelphi University
David H. Mangnall, Newark College of Engineering

LOCAL ARRANGEMENTS:

John M. Claunch, Chairman, Southern Methodist University
Warren K. Agee, Texas Christian University
N. Lee Dunham, Baylor University

MEMBERSHIP:

Executive Secretary, Chairman
Executive Committee

NOMINATING:

Richard T. Deters, S.J., Chairman, Xavier University
Joseph P. Goddard, University of Tennessee
Barbara W. Northrup, Elmira College
Russell F.W. Smith, New York University
Edwin H. Spengler, Brooklyn College

PROGRAM:

Robert C. Osborne, Chairman, Pratt Institute
Joseph P. Goddard, Vice Chairman, University of Tennessee
Dean B. Armold, Pennsylvania Military College

PROGRAM: (Con't.)

John M. Claunch, Southern Methodist University
Thomas J. Desmond, Utica College
Nicholas Kish, State University of New York at Buffalo
Maurice J. O'Sullivan, Sacred Heart University
Donald L. Peets, Sir George Williams University
Peter B. Siegle,
    Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults

PUBLIC RELATIONS:

Edwin H. Spengler, Chairman, Brooklyn College
Raymond P. Witte, Vice Chairman,
    Loyola University of New Orleans
Kermit K. Johnson, Manatee Junior College
Sherman V.N. Kent, Rider College
Edward D. Shanken, Pratt Institute
Robert W. Shaw, Queens College, North Carolina

REGIONS:

Frank T. Carroll, Jr. Chairman,
    Louisiana State University
David H. Mangnall, Vice Chairman,
    Newark College of Engineering
Virgil Alexander, Northern Illinois University
Gerald A. Sugrue, University of San Francisco

RELATIONSHIPS WITH OTHER ASSOCIATIONS:

Richard A. Mumma, Chairman,
    The Johns Hopkins University
William C. Huffman, Vice Chairman
    University of Louisville
Edwin P. Banks, University of Colorado
Richard Bray, The American University
Francis Emery, F.S.C., LaSalle College
Thomas A. Emmet, University of Detroit
A. A. Liveright,
    Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults
Curtis H. Moore, Rockford College
Frank R. Neuffler, University of Cincinnati

RESEARCH:

Alan B. Knox, Chairman, University of Nebraska
Lawrence A. Allen, Vice Chairman, Northeastern University
Alexander Charters, Syracuse University
Richard T. Deters, S.J., Xavier University
Walter H. Hayes, Jr., University of Maryland
Donald B. Setterbo, University of Toledo
James B. Whipple,
    Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults
Kingsley M. Wientge, Washington University

RESOLUTIONS:

Hyman Lichtenstein, Chairman, Hofstra University
Raymond W. Aiken, The American University
Thomas J. Dolphin, Clark University

SPECIAL PROGRAMS FOR WOMEN:

Adelaide Jones, Chairman, Drury College
Helen Crockett, University of Wichita
Barbara W. Northrup, Elmira College
Leo V. Ryan, C.S.V., Marquette University
Robert Snow, Syracuse University

STATISTICAL REPORTS:

Howell W. McGee, Chairman, University of Oklahoma
Frank R. Neuffer, University of Cincinnati
Edward C. Pappert, University of Windsor

TEACHER EDUCATION THROUGH EVENING PROGRAMS:

Grover L. Angel, Chairman, George Washington University
Richard Bray, Vice Chairman, The American University
Virgil Alexander, Northern Illinois University
Arthur L. Assum, University of Rochester
Henry D. Carpenter, Jr., Virginia State College - Norfolk
Edward Cooper, University of Maryland
Freda Goldman,
Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults
Richard A. Mumma, The Johns Hopkins University
Martin J. O'Hara, Thomas More Institute

APPENDIX C

OFFICERS AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
1965-66

PRESIDENT

Robert F. Berner,
State University of New York at Buffalo

VICE-PRESIDENT

Ernest E. McMahon,
Rutgers - The State University

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

Howell W. McGee,
University of Oklahoma

CHAIRMAN, ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Ralph C. Kendall,
University of Toledo

EDITOR, NEWSLETTER

Gurth I. Abercrombie,
Northeastern University

DIRECTORS-AT-LARGE

William C. Huffman,
University of Louisville

Curtis H. Moore,
Rockford College

Donald L. Peets,
Sir George Williams University

Clifford L. Winters, Jr.,
Syracuse University

APPENDIX D

ROSTER OF ATTENDANCE - DALLAS, 1965

1. Abercrombie, Gurth I.
   Northeastern University
2. Adams, Viers W.
   University of Pittsburgh
3. Alexander, Virgil
   Northern Illinois University
4. Alexander, Mrs. Virgil
   Northern Illinois University
5. Allen, M. Robert
   University of Miami
6. Angel, Dr. Grover L.
   George Washington University
7. Antoniades, Helen
   Millard Fillmore College
8. Armold, Dean B.
   Pennsylvania Military College
9. Armold, Mrs. Dean B.
   Pennsylvania Military College
10. Assum, Arthur
    University of Rochester
11. Baker, James F.
    Boston University
12. Baker, Mrs. James F.
    Boston University
13. Banks, Edwin P.
    University of Colorado
14. Barden, Lawrence C.
    Drexel Institute
15. Barrows, Leo B., S.J.
    St. Peter's College
16. Barton, William D.
    University of Tennessee
17. Baumann, Edward J.
    Villa Madonna College
18. Benfield, Howard W.
    Drexel Institute
19. Benfield, Mrs. Howard W.
    Drexel Institute
20. Berner, Robert F.
    State University of New York at Buffalo
21. Berner, Mrs. Robert F.
    State University of New York at Buffalo
22. Betz, Paul R.
    St. Joseph College
23. Bills, Sam C.
    University of Tennessee

24. Blake, John M.
    University of Maine
25. Blake, Mrs. John M.
    University of Maine
26. Bowling, Donald G.
    University of Missouri
27. Bray, Richard
    The American University
28. Brotherton, W.A.
    Memphis State University
29. Brown, James G.
    George Washington University
30. Bruderle, Charles P.
    Villanova University
31. Brutvan, Donald R.
    State University of New York
32. Bryde, Thomas J.
    Iona College
33. Buckley, Charles J.
    University of Scranton
34. Burchard, Kenneth R.
    Carnegie Institute of Technology
35. Burchard, Mrs. Kenneth R.
    Carnegie Institute of Technology
36. Burgess, Frederick M.
    Villanova University
37. Burgess, Mrs. Frederick M.
    Villanova University
38. Burns, John J., S.J.
    Loyola College, Baltimore
39. Bushey, Glenn L.
    University of Chattanooga
40. Charters, Alexander N.
    Syracuse University
41. Chester, Ed
    University of Tennessee
42. Chiles, R. E.
    Hunter College
43. Clancy, Matthew J.
    International Association of Evening
    Student Councils
44. Claunch, John M.
    Southern Methodist University
45. Claunch, Mrs. John M.
    Southern Methodist University
46. Coniff, John J., S.J.
    St. Joseph's College
47. Conner, John D.
    Massachusetts Bay Community College
48. Cooper, Edward F.
    University of Maryland

49. Crockett, Mrs. Helen
    Wichita State University
50. Crowley, Charles M., S.J.
    Boston College
51. Cuddy, Brother Henry
    St. Francis College
52. Cummings, Thomas
    Syracuse University
53. Daigneault, George R.
    University of California
54. Davis, James B.
    Louisiana State University in New Orleans
55. Dean, Ralph C.
    Bryant College
56. Demarest, G. Stuart
    Rutgers University
57. Demarest, Mrs. G. Stuart
    Rutgers University
58. Desmond, Thomas J.
    Utica College
59. Deters, Richard T., S.J.
    Xavier University
60. Dobbins, Cecil L.
    University of Akron
61. Dohn, Mrs. Catharine L.
    State University of New York
62. Dolphin, Thomas J.
    Clark University
63. Donohue, John P.
    Loyola University
64. Douglass, Francis
    Indiana Central College
65. Douglass, Mrs. Francis
    Indiana Central College
66. Dudley, Ernest A.
    University of Hartford
67. Dudley, Mrs. Ernest A.
    University of Hartford
68. Dunham, N. Lee
    Baylor University
69. Dunham, Mrs. N. Lee
    Baylor University
70. Egginton, Mary T.
    Adelphi University
71. Ehrensberger, Ray
    University of Maryland
72. Eley, Lynn W.
    Washington University
73. Elliott, Carl H.
    Purdue University

74. Emery, Brother Francis
LaSalle College
75. Emmel, Thomas A.
University of Detroit
76. Evans, A. A.
Drury College
77. Evans, Mrs. A. A.
Drury College
78. Everett, Albert E.
Northeastern University
79. Farmer, Martha L.
City College, CUNY
80. Farrell, Matthew
Seton Hall University
81. Fitzgerald, T. E.
Temple University
82. Fitzgerald, Mrs. T. E.
Temple University
83. Fridinger, Walter P.
University of Maine
84. Fuller, Melvin E.
Roanoke College
85. Fulton, Albert M.
University of Minnesota
86. Fulton, Mrs. Albert M.
University of Minnesota
87. Funk, Frank E.
Syracuse University
88. Gavin, Donald P.
John Carroll University
89. Gleaves, George
University of Tennessee
90. Goas, T. Stewart
Pennsylvania State University
91. Goas, Mrs. T. Stewart
Pennsylvania State University
92. Goddard, Joseph
University of Tennessee
93. Grauel, George E.
John Carroll University
94. Gwiazda, Stanley
Drexel Institute
95. Gwiazda, Mrs. Stanley
Drexel Institute
96. Hartig, Marvin E.
Evansville College
97. Hartig, Mrs. Marvin E.
Evansville College
98. Hayes, Walter H.
University of Maryland
99. Hayes, Mrs. Walter H.
University of Maryland

100. Heatwole, Raymond W.
    Furman University
101. Henninger, Harold
    University of Georgia
102. Henninger, Mrs. Harold
    University of Georgia
103. Henninger, Kenneth V.
    Illinois Institute of Technology
104. Henninger, Mrs. Kenneth V.
    Illinois Institute of Technology
105. Herrmann, D. J.
    College of William and Mary
106. Hill, John
    Indiana Central College
107. Hiller, Carl E.
    Queens College - New York
108. Hodges, Mrs. Sophia U.
    Richmond Professional Institute
109. Hoppe, William A.
    University of South Alabama
110. Huffman, William C.
    University of Louisville
111. Huffman, Mrs. William C.
    University of Louisville
112. Hungerford, Curtin R.
    University of Southern California
113. Hyde, Ralph A.
    University of Tennessee
114. Ilowit, Roy
    C. W. Post College
115. Ilowit, Mrs. Roy
    C. W. Post College
116. Ingham, Roy J.
    Florida State University
117. Jaros, Andrew G.
    Oklahoma City University
118. Jolda, Joseph M.
    Worcester Junior College
119. Jolda, Mrs. Joseph M.
    Worcester Junior College
120. Jones, Adelaide H.
    Drury College
121. Jones, H. R.
    University of Tulsa
122. Jung, Allen F.
    Loyola University
123. Jung, Mrs. Allen F.
    Loyola University
124. Kelly, William F.
    University of Louisville

125. Kendall, Ralph C.
University of Toledo
126. Kendall, Mrs. Ralph C.
University of Toledo
127. Kent, Sherman
Rider College
128. King, Donald
University of Colorado
,Colorado Springs Center
129. Kish, Nicholas
State University of New York at Buffalo
130. Kitchin, William W.
Christopher Newport College
131. Knerr, George F.
Pace College
132. Lang, Daniel
Northwestern University
133. Lanier, William F.
The American University - Washington, D.C.
134. Larson, Karl J.
Northeastern University
135. LaRusso, D. A.
University of Washington
136. LaRusso, Mrs. D. A.
University of Washington
137. Lichtenstein, Hyman
Hofstra University
138. Liveright, Alexander A.
Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults
139. Lorenzetti, Anthony F.
Canisius College
140. Ludlow, Mrs. Anne
University of Rochester
141. Lyons, Miss Dee
University of Louisville
142. McDaniel, Clyde
Virginia State College, Norfolk Division
143. McGee, Howell
University of Oklahoma
144. McGuff, Harry A.
Indiana Central College
145. McMahon, Ernest
Rutgers - The State University
146. McMahon, Mrs. Ernest
Rutgers - The State University
147. Mangnall, David H.
Newark College of Engineering
148. Mason, Harold P.
University of Tennessee
149. Matre, Richard A.
Loyola University - Chicago

150. Meyer, Peter
    Queens College - New York
151. Minnis, Roy B.
    United States Office of Education
152. Montgomery, George
    Drexel Institute
153. Montgomery, Mrs. George
    Drexel Institute
154. Moore, Curtis
    Rockford Evening College
155. Moore, Mrs. Curtis
    Rockford Evening College
156. Morgan, Paul C.
    University of Southern Mississippi
157. Morgan, Mrs. Paul C.
    University of Southern Mississippi
158. Mumma, Richard A.
    The Johns Hopkins University
159. Neuffer, Frank R.
    University of Cincinnati
160. Nickson, Thomas B.
    State University of New York at Buffalo
161. Nierenberg, Harold
    Long Island University
162. Noble, Albert C.
    East Tennessee State University
163. O'Brien, Rev. John E.
    Seton Hall University
164. O'Connor, R. Eric, S.J.
    Thomas More Institute
165. O'Hara, J. Martin
    Thomas More Institute
166. Osborne, Robert C.
    Pratt Institute
167. Osborne, Mrs. Robert C.
    Pratt Institute
168. O'Sullivan, Maurice
    Sacred Heart University
169. Palmer, T. C.
    Texas Christian University
170. Pappert, Rev. Edward C.
    University of Windsor
171. Parker, John
    University of Denver
172. Peets, Donald L.
    Sir George Williams University
173. Peets, Mrs. Donald L.
    Sir George Williams University
174. Pliska, Stanley R.
    Old Dominion College
175. Power, Franklin A.
    Boston University

176. Quimper, James R.
    University of Maryland
177. Quimper, Mrs. James R.
    University of Maryland
178. Rasmussen, Neal A.
    South-Western Publishing Company
179. Reese, Clyde
    The University of Tennessee
180. Robbins, Richard D.
    The Johns Hopkins University
181. Robinson, Chester H.
    Hunter College
182. Saums, Edmund R.
    Western Reserve University
183. Schmidt, Ethel E.
    State University of New York at Buffalo
184. Schmidt, Ralph L. W.
    Louisiana State University
185. Setterbo, Donald B.
    University of Toledo
186. Settle, Kenneth B.
    University of Cincinnati
187. Shanken, Edward D.
    Engineers Joint Council
188. Sharer, Robert E.
    Michigan State University
189. Shaw, Robert W.
    Queens College - North Carolina
190. Sheats, Paul H.
    University of California
191. Smart, N.
    Baylor University
192. Smith, David J.
    LaSalle College
193. Smith, Russell F.W.
    New York University
194. Snarr, Otto W.
    Bradley University
195. Snarr, Mrs. Otto W.
    Bradley University
196. Southouse, James W.
    University of Bridgeport
197. Spengler, Edwin
    Brooklyn College
198. Spengler, Mrs. Edwin
    Brooklyn College
199. Spohrer, Myron A.
    Washington University
200. Stark, John D.
    Temple University

201. Stutts, Herbert P.
The American University
202. Stillwell, Hamilton
Wayne State University
203. Stillwell, Mrs. Hamilton
Wayne State University
204. St. Romain, Clyde D.
Tulane University
205. St. Romain, Mrs. Clyde D.
Tulane University
206. Sugrue, F. Gerald, S.J.
University of San Francisco
207. Tansey, Miss Charlotte
Thomas More Institute
208. Thompson, Clarence H.
Drake University
209. Thompson, Mrs. Clarence H.
Drake University
210. Titus, Vernon R.
Rochester Institute of Technology
211. Titus, Mrs. Vernon R.
Rochester Institute of Technology
212. Tooker, Mrs. Henry
Baylor University
213. Towsley, Robert J.
State University of New York at Buffalo
214. Utley, William T.
University of Omaha
215. Utley, Mrs. William T.
University of Omaha
216. Van Gorder, Lewis G.
Georgia State College
217. Vaccaro, Louis C.
Marquette University
218. Varnado, Alban F.
Louisiana State University in New Orleans
219. Wangler, John
University of Detroit
220. Wangler, Mrs. John
University of Detroit
221. Ward, Howard A.
University of Detroit
222. Ward, Mrs. Howard A.
University of Detroit
223. Wientge, Kingsley M.
Washington University - St. Louis
224. Wientge, Mrs. Kingsley M.
Washington University - St. Louis
225. Witte, Raymond P.
Loyola University - New Orleans
226. Witte, Mrs. Raymond P.
Loyola University - New Orleans
227. Woods, Donald Z.
University of Minnesota
228. Wynn, Thomas J.
DePaul University

APPENDIX E

AUEC COMMITTEE STRUCTURE 1965-66

ADVISORY:

Ralph C. Kendall, Chairman, University of Toledo
Ernest Brandenburg, Drury College
Alexander Charters, Syracuse University
Richard T. Deters, Xavier University
John P. Dyer, Tulane University
Daniel R. Lang, Northwestern University
Richard A. Matre, Loyola University of Chicago
Richard A. Mumma, The Johns Hopkins University
Frank R. Neuffer, University of Cincinnati

DEAN'S DESK:

Harold A. Shanafield, Northwestern University

EDITOR OF PROCEEDINGS:

Hyman Lichtenstein, Hofstra University

EVENING STUDENT PERSONNEL:

Peter Meyer, Chairman, Queens College,
City University of New York
Mary T. Egginton, Adelphi University
Reuben McDaniel, Jr., Baldwin-Wallace College
Richard D. Robbins, The Johns Hopkins University
Myron A. Spohrer, Washington University of St. Louis
Jerald I. Hirsch, Newark College of Engineering
Elliott S. Palais, Pratt Institute
Peter E. Siegle, Center for the Study of Liberal
Education for Adults
George F. Knerr, Pace College
Thomas A. Emmet, University of Detroit
William Kelly, University of Louisville

BUDGET-FINANCE:

Edward C. Pappert, Chairman, University of Windsor
Stewart L. Bowen, Regis College
George J. Spears, Russell Sage College

LEGISLATIVE:

Martha L. Farmer, Chairman, City College,
City University of New York
Sol Jacobson, Vice Chairman, Brooklyn College,
City University of New York
Byron C. Lambert, Fairleigh Dickinson University
George F. Knerr, Pace College
Hyman Lichtenstein, Hofstra University
Milton Stern, New York University

LEGISLATIVE: (Con't.)

James E. Tobin, Queens College, City University of New York
Richard F. Clemo, Adelphi University
Grover L. Angel, George Washington University

LOCAL ARRANGEMENTS:

Nicholas Kish, Chairman, State University of New York at Buffalo
Anthony F. Lorenzetti, Canisius College
P. Austin Derrig, Niagara University
Arthur L. Assum, University of Rochester
Victor Scroger, Rochester Institute of Technology
Harold Kentner, Rochester Institute of Technology
Ethel E. Schmidt, State University of New York at Buffalo
Barbara W. Northrup, Elmira College
Leo E. Keenan, Saint Bonaventure University

MEMBERSHIP:

Executive Secretary, Chairman
Executive Committee

PROMOTING MEMBERSHIP:

Melvin E. Fuller, Chairman, Roanoke College

NOMINATING:

Ralph C. Kendall, Chairman, University of Toledo
Mary T. Egginton, Adelphi University
Richard Bray, The American University
Robert C. Osborne, Pratt Institute
Clarence H. Thompson, Drake University
D. B. Armold, Pennsylvania Military College

PROGRAM:

Joseph P. Goddard, Chairman, University of Tennessee
Clarence H. Thompson, Vice Chairman, Drake University
Nicholas Kish, State University of New York at Buffalo
Donald B. Setterbo, University of Toledo
Robert W. Shaw, Queens College, North Carolina
Kenneth B. Settle, University of Cincinnati
Lynn W. Eley, Washington University of St. Louis
William T. Utley, University of Omaha
Freda H. Goldman, Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults
Hyman Lichtenstein, Hofstra University
Peter Siegle, Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults

PUBLIC RELATIONS:

James F. Baker, Chairman, Boston University
James W. Southouse, University of Bridgeport
Charles M. Crowley, Boston College
Robert C. Osborne, Pratt Institute
Robert Shaw, Queens College, North Carolina

REGIONS:

Frank T. Carroll, Chairman, Delgado Institute, New Orleans
Sherman V. N. Kent, Vice Chairman, Rider College
Gerald A. Sugrue, University of San Francisco
Edwin P. Banks, University of Colorado

RELATIONSHIPS WITH OTHER ASSOCIATIONS:

Richard T. Deters, Chairman, Xavier University
Frank R. Neuffer, University of Cincinnati
Viers W. Adams, University of Pittsburgh
Thomas A. Emmet, University of Detroit
Richard A. Matre, Loyola University of Chicago
Clifford L. Winters, Syracuse University

RESEARCH:

Lawrence A. Allen, Chairman, Northeastern University
Roy J. Ingham, Vice Chairman, Florida State University
Kingsley M. Wientge, Washington University of St. Louis
Walter H. Hayes, Jr., University of Maryland
Bernard H. Stern, Brooklyn College, City University of New York
Thomas J. Dolphin, Clark University
Charles P. Bruderle, Villanova College

RESOLUTIONS:

Raymond P. Witte, Chairman, Loyola University of New Orleans
John S. Quinn, College of William and Mary
Lawrence C. Barden, Drexel Institute of Technology
George W.C. Brown, Norfolk State College

SPECIAL PROGRAMS FOR WOMEN:

Adelaide H. Jones, Chairman, Drury College
Helen M. Crockett, University of Wichita
Barbara W. Northrup, Elmira College
R. Jack Freeman, University of Mississippi

GUIDELINES FOR EXCELLENCE BUSINESS PROGRAMS:

Thomas J. Bryde, Chairman, Iona College

GUIDELINES FOR EXCELLENCE
BUSINESS PROGRAMS: (Con't.)

William C. Huffman, University of Louisville
Allen F. Jung, University of Chicago
James R. Quimper, University of Maryland
George E. Grauel, John Carroll University
Thomas J. Wynn, De Paul University
Robert L. MacDonald, University of Pennsylvania
Theodore E. Fitzgerald, Temple University

GUIDELINES FOR EXCELLENCE
TEACHER EDUCATION:

Edward F. Cooper, Chairman, University of Maryland
Richard Bray, Vice Chairman, The American University
Grover L. Angel, George Washington University
Virgil W. Alexander, Northern Illinois University
William T. Utley, University of Omaha
Martin J. O'Hara, Thomas More Institute
Richard D. Robbins, The Johns Hopkins University

GUIDELINES FOR EXCELLENCE
ENGINEERING:

David H. Mangnall, Chairman, Newark College of Engineering
Stanley J. Gwiazda, Vice Chairman, Drexel Institute of Technology
Kenneth Henninger, University of Illinois
J.W. Hostetter, Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn
Russell A. Norton, Rochester Institute of Technology
Carl H. Elliott, Purdue University
Kenneth R. Burchard, Carnegie Institute of Technology
Edward D. Shanken, Engineers' Joint Council

GUIDELINES FOR EXCELLENCE
GENERAL EDUCATION: ARTS & SCIENCES:

Edward Spengler, Chairman, Brooklyn College, City University of New York
Daniel R. Lang, Northwestern University
James B. Whipple, Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults
Arthur L. Assum, University of Rochester
Byron C. Lambert, Fairleigh Dickinson University
Richard A. Mumma, The Johns Hopkins University
Richard T. Deters, Xavier University
Curtis H. Moore, Rockford College

GUIDELINES FOR EXCELLENCE
COMMUNITY SERVICE: URBAN EXTENSION:

Ernest E. McMahon, Chairman, Rutgers - The State University
Russell F.W. Smith, Vice Chairman, New York University
Kenneth Haygood, Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults
A.A. Liveright, Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults
Hamilton Stillwell, Wayne State University
R. Eric O'Connor, Thomas More Institute
Clifford L. Winters, Jr., Syracuse University
W. J. McCallion, McMaster College
Frank E. Funk, Syracuse University

ERIC Clearinghouse
JUL 10 1968
on Adult Education